

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. XVI.

FEBRUARY, 1897.

No. 4.

[FOR CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.]

THE RITSCHLIAN REFORM MOVEMENT IN GERMANY AND SWEDEN.

BY RICHERT VON KOCH.

I PROPOSE here to give a general idea of the religious reform now going on in Germany and Sweden, which has been called by the name of its chief promoter, the late Professor Albrecht Ritschl, of Göttingen. To describe it in detail would require a large volume.

This religious movement may be said to be a continuation of the Lutheran reformation, which, after having worked wonders during a short space of time, then for some unaccountable reason suddenly stopped short, took form, or got petrified into creeds, formulas, and catechisms, and has since remained almost unchanged until to-day, when it has again begun its onward march.

When I say that the Protestant Reformation discontinued its onward course for some unaccountable reason, I do not mean that one might not attempt to account for it, but only that an explanation of so singular an incident must always remain more or less unsatisfactory and incomplete, just as when one tries to explain some similar occurrence in the life or mental history of an individual, for the human race as a whole (or part of it) resembles in many respects the individual human being. Its behavior is often analogous. When an onward movement is observed to have commenced in the mind of a man, the expectation *à priori*

would be that it will continue its onward course, if nothing visible occurs to stop it; and yet experience shows us that it is not always so. We see the movement continue steadily for some time. Then something seems to have happened, we know not what. The pace slackens, he halts at fitful intervals, and is at last brought to a standstill. There does not appear to be any reason for him to make a halt at this place, and yet he does make a halt, and, what is more, here he remains for a long time, maybe to his life's end. His mental force may have been spent, or he may have reached a point which suited his particular form of mind. He could go no further, at least for a time, or his powers may have been diverted into another direction and toward other objects. We may guess, but we cannot be sure of being right as to the real reason of his stopping short, for the inner man is a dark continent to us. We know very little if anything of what it conceals, what forces lie there dormant, or of what strength they may prove when awakened. Innumerable factors may have been at work or are still, of which we know nothing. Others, which we seemed to know, have proved weaker than we believed, and have already spent their energy. In short, we may guess, but we can never be sure.

Human beings in the aggregate form, nations, or many nations moved by the same impulse behave in much the same way. They make a brilliant advance, and then all of a sudden they stop short. Perhaps they had reached a mental or religious resting-place that suited them, like a horde of Eastern people during their wanderings. Perhaps it was simply that their leader died—there was no longer any one to guide them. No one told them in what direction to go, and so they remained where they were and took root in the soil.

This last was probably one of the chief reasons why the Protestant Reformation left off advancing. Luther died, and the other principal reformers also left their flocks without any great leaders, and so the flocks remained where they were, no one conducting them to

higher and still better pastures. Had Luther lived longer, and had he retained to the end all the strength of his bold, searching mind, there is little doubt that the Reformation called by his name would have gone on advancing and been left at last upon a much higher religious elevation than was now the case; but he died, and no one caught up his mantle as it fell.

Then began the rapid process of religious petrification—in fact, we must admit that it had already in some degree begun before Luther's death. The Christian belief was reduced to printed "confessions," "articles," and "formulas." Luther had been obliged to do this himself, partly in his early attempts to reconcile the reformed religion with that of Rome, for even Luther labored under that deadly and yet so universal mistake, that it would be a beautiful and highly to be desired state of things if all believed the same in religious matters, partly also because his followers obliged him to formulate their belief for them; for we always like to have our belief in black and white, in chapter and verse; so Luther was obliged to write down what his adherents were to believe in answer to their cry, "Tell us what our creed is! Give us our religion in words, chapters, and articles, that we may know exactly what it is we believe, and what is papistical and dangerous doctrine!" And he did so.

But this was not at all in accordance with Luther's own view of how religion should be given to human beings; nay, it was in downright contradiction to his own view. Luther denied the right of any one to formulate the belief of another human being. He denied that right to the sovereign Roman Church, and he was far from wishing to usurp such power himself. The very last thing he desired was to establish a new Protestant papacy—a papacy in which a written creed was to be the supreme spiritual authority, fixed and immutable, for he saw clearly that this would be even worse than the Roman Catholic papacy. A "paper pope" must be a worse thing than a living pope, for the living pope might advance, carried on irresistibly by the growth of human thought and the

advance of religion in thinking men's minds ; but a "*paper pope*" fixed once and for all must very soon become a petrification, where the letter would be everything, the spirit nothing—a very mummy of religion.

And yet this was what Luther at last felt himself compelled to do and did. Luther, the very same man who had fought for the right of every one to read his Bible himself, and to understand its beautiful, mostly symbolical language as God helped him to understand it—Luther, who at the Diet of Worms had insisted on his Christian liberty to stand independent of the teaching of the Roman Church, as regards the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures—Luther formulated (or let others formulate) the Christian creed in every single detail and put it all down on paper.

By the rule of this "*paper pope*" the great Protestant churches have remained content to abide during three hundred years.

The dissenters have not been content to abide by it. They have claimed their right of understanding the Scriptures according to their own interpretation. So far they have been true followers of Luther and his principles of religious liberty and free expounding of the Word of God, but there they have stopped. They have, as a rule, arrogated to themselves alone the sole right of explaining the Scriptures. In almost every case the sects have pronounced the sentence of eternal damnation upon those who believe differently from themselves. It has generally been expressed somewhat in this form : " Every one has certainly the right to interpret the Scriptures by the light given him, but he who interprets them in any way differently from ourselves will most assuredly be damned through all eternity, for ours is the only right interpretation."

It is always the same. The Protestant churches and the Protestant sects are merely reformed papal churches, petty tyrants, each and all as infallible as the great papal Church of Rome itself.

Professor Albrecht Ritschl, of Göttingen, has at last raised the standard of revolt against all this despotic infallibility. He and his followers once more (like

Luther and his men) claim their right to understand the Scriptures as they may and can with the guidance of the Holy Spirit, untrammelled by formulas or church creeds. They deny the right of any church to decide for the individual Christian what his creed ought to be. The Bible and nothing but the Bible contains the word of God unto salvation, and every one has a right to explain the Bible as best he may and can. No tyranny! No church papacy! Every one his own pope. No creeds, no written beliefs, no theological systems. One of Dr. Ritschl's favorite expressions used to be, "*Aber um Gottes Willen keine Schule!*" (But for Heaven's sake no "school"!)

Let no one suppose, however, that this means that Dr. Ritschl considers it of little importance what people believe in religious matters, or that he is himself unsettled in his own belief. Professor Ritschl has expressed his own belief regarding every possible theological question in the most explicit terms. He is as little of a latitudinarian as may be; but he compels no one to accept his belief. He seems to have, in the most complete manner, accepted the great principle of religious liberty and toleration. He leaves unexplained the great problem how it can be possible that Divine truth appears different to different minds, and yet every view may be just as true as the others. Maybe, however, he does not think so, but rather that the danger of being wrong is not so very great. Anyhow, "let every one be convinced in his own mind," that is enough for Dr. Ritschl and his followers, and I will add that as yet they have shown no signs of swerving from this great principle of universal toleration. Hitherto they do not appear to have attempted forming any general "school" or theological system. They are all called Ritschlians. They are all warm Christians, but they mostly all differ as much as it is possible to differ in their theological views. Hardly two of them think alike on any point. Never was there such thoroughgoing carrying out of the principle "agree to differ." The world awaits with the utmost interest and anxiety to see how long they can be true to this

principle, which has hitherto never been successfully carried out in theological matters.

So far I have described only what may possibly be called the purely negative side or aspect of Ritschlianism—its followers' refusal to acknowledge any authority in matters of faith beyond the Bible itself; but there is a more positive side as well. If the Ritschlians are firm in upholding the liberty of every one to form his belief as best he may from out of the Bible, and from nowhere else, be it Protestant formulas or papal bulls, they are as firm in declaring from what part of the Bible that belief ought to be taken.

The Ritschlians say that the Christian belief is to be found only in one part of the Scriptures, and that part the New Testament; but they go farther still. Not even in the whole of the New Testament is the Christian's religion absolutely correctly described and put forth. It is only in the four Gospels and in the life and teaching of Christ Himself that the religion of Christ is to be found pure and unalloyed. There the Christian has therefore to search for his religion. Without doubt, and most certainly the rest of the New Testament and also the Old Testament may with the greatest advantage be studied, and ought to be studied, but if in these other parts anything be found in the slightest degree at variance with or even different from Christ's own teaching, then such matter shall be considered as not of Divine origin, but rather the result of mere human knowledge or wisdom, and therefore more or less unreliable as regards its source, and possibly perilous in its effects upon Christian life and Christian belief.

It is hardly necessary to point out that this all-important part of the Ritschlian system aims a deadly blow at one of the fundamental beliefs of many Christians, the Divine inspiration of the whole Bible, and more particularly of the New Testament. That is so. The Ritschlians do not accept the inspiration of the entire Bible, neither in the literal nor in the ordinary acceptance of that word. It would appear, however, as if they admitted the inspiration of one part of it, the

four Gospels, or, perhaps still more correctly, of those parts of the Gospels which relate to the life and teaching of Jesus Christ Himself.

Many Christians will probably be astonished to hear that there exist any real (and not merely verbal or apparent) differences between the teaching of Christ and the teaching of the other writers in the New Testament. "That cannot be," they will perhaps say. "It is all God's word, His inspired truth, and therefore it must agree, if you do but study it sufficiently and in the right spirit."

The Ritschlian theologians (some of the most learned exegetists of the world) seem to be of a different way of thinking. One of their chief men, Dr. Wendt, Theological Professor in the University of Jena, is most certainly of a different opinion. He has written a little book with this title, "The Teaching of St. Paul compared with the Teaching of Jesus," in which he points out a great many discrepancies between the teaching of Christ and that of the great apostle. Some of these seem to be very important indeed.

These are the learned professor's words in the book just mentioned :

"In point of fact, the theology of the Reformation and the Protestant dogmas belonging to it are chiefly sprung from the writings of St. Paul. Now as long as it was everywhere accepted that the entire contents of the Holy Scriptures were in complete accordance with each other, dogmatical doctrines were looked upon as proved to be authentic and absolutely binding by the mere fact of their having been shown to rest on the writings of St. Paul ; but in our times it is no longer possible for Protestant Christians possessing a theological education to accept the word 'Pauline' as being identical (or synonymous) with 'biblical,' or as being necessarily in accordance with Christ's own teaching. The steadily progressing systematic study of the Scriptures has more and more clearly led to the conclusion that the manifold 'spheres of teaching,' to be found in the Bible, cannot be any longer simply grouped together with or referred to each other. We

now find that these various parts or 'spheres' contain such differences as prove them to belong to various periods of time, and to derive their origin from authors of varied character and education, and also from different stages of development in the Old Testamental and the New Testamental religion. In short, the Holy Scriptures as a whole do not prove themselves as offering us a firm, consistently uniform basis and rule for our teaching and belief. Therefore . . . we must rise from the old standpoint or conception, that Holy Writ, by means of its miraculous inspiration, offers us, equally in all its parts, Divine revelation in determining our belief. We must rise, I say, to the higher thought that Jesus Christ alone gave unto mankind the one and perfect revelation, and that He did this by means of the Gospel He gave us concerning the kingdom of God, which He furthermore exemplified and made intelligible to us by His own life and work. By this Gospel He has become the founder of our Christian religion. If we therefore wish to determine what is pure and unalloyed Christianity, we must use His Gospel as the touchstone or standard. The Holy Scriptures derive their especial value, above all other Christian literature, from their being a collection of those writings which teach us to know Jesus Christ and to understand His Gospel in that historical sequence or connection in which it has been given to the world ; but in determining the measure of the authority and importance of the different biblical 'spheres of teaching' and various special biblical views in forming our Christian belief, we have to look at one thing alone, and that is how far they can be shown to be in accordance with the complete revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself."

It is needless to say that every one is free to disagree with Professor Wendt, and to declare that Christ and St. Paul are in accordance with each other in every word and every sense, but a great many people already agree with the learned theologian that these differences really exist, and the number of those who believe so is increasing every day.

It is naturally an interesting question what may have been the proximate cause of the Ritschlian reform movement, besides the natural longing of inquiring minds to search for truth in so important a matter as religious belief and its foundations.

In reply to this question it is possible to offer three or four reasons, without, however, claiming for them any great degree of certainty as being the right ones.

1. The religious mind of the world may now be prepared for a further advance upon the road of religious reform after the long repose it has taken during the last three hundred years.

2. The intensely pursued and extremely successful course of biblical criticism of our day has at length forced the theological mind to the conclusion that it was impossible any longer to accept the theory of the complete concordance of the Holy Scriptures. We have already seen Professor Wendt give this as a reason. There were passages which could not be made to accord with one another. It became necessary to choose between the authority of Christ in the four Gospels and that of the writers of the other books in the New Testament. Naturally Christ was the one chosen, and He thus regained the authority beyond or above the other teachers which He had before seemed to have in some unaccountable way been deprived of.

And yet it was perhaps not so unaccountable as it appeared at first sight. Theoretically, indeed, Christ had now lost His supreme authority. No one had ever questioned His being absolute in His own religion, but another factor came in which virtually rendered this admission of little or no practical effect. The whole Bible was explicitly declared to be "inspired," to be God's own inspired word.¹ It is still so considered by many Christians, as we well know. But if that be so, then all the writers of the Bible are on the same level, for they are all equally the mouth-pieces of the Most High. Even Christ Himself can

¹ It was formally and distinctly declared to be so by the "Formula Consensus Helvetic" of 1675 which teaches that every word, letter, and vowel sign (in the Hebrew) was divinely inspired.

give us no higher truth than "the word of God." And in this way He loses the pre-eminence which is theoretically accorded Him, and His words carry no more authority than those of St. Paul, for both give us "the word of God."

3. Christian men found that during the lapse of the centuries the *religion* of Christ—that is, His own teaching—had got to be so covered up by, so buried underneath the huge amount of *theology* which had been partly evolved out of the various New Testament writers (more especially St. Paul), partly also fabricated by the Fathers, œcumenical councils, popes, and other church authorities, that it was no longer possible to distinguish between what was Christ's religion and the Church's religion, to penetrate into, or, to use a homely phrase, to "get at" the teaching of Christ Himself. The Ritschlian reform movement, like so many other more or less successful movements of the same kind, may therefore be looked upon as a desperate effort to return to the pure and unmixed religion of Christ, as taught by Himself alone.

4. The mind of man has moved on enormously during the last three centuries, while religion has, so to speak, stood still. It no longer answers to the wants of the modern mind at the close of the nineteenth century. Our age is constantly being accused by the Church of being irreligious. A great deal of this talk is unjust and unfounded. The modern mind is not irreligious, but it requires religion of a far higher sort than that of the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries, which is still the Church's religion. The whole conception of God and His dealings with man requires to be raised to the present level of the human intelligence. No wonder if it has turned with disgust from what has generally been offered it by the Church, her threats of eternal damnation in a material hell, whether for misconduct or heterodoxy, her promises of an idle elysian sort of heaven for the orthodox repentant sinner, her Jewish conception of an offended Creator to be propitiated by the blood and sufferings of the innocent for the misdeeds or unbelief of others. No, most

of these accusations of unbelief or irreligion are unfounded. Not only is there a great amount of religious warmth in many places, but even science itself, that especial unbeliever, has shown signs of a return to religion, to the belief in a personal God. Science has, so to speak, been slowly working out a religion of its own. Having long ago discarded the low and childish religion, which was found to be irreconcilable with already discovered laws of mind and matter, science has now, in its rapid and enormous advance toward a general idea of the laws of the universe, discovered such evidences of mind in those laws that it has once more bent its knee in humble adoration of the master mind which can work such wonders in such marvellously skilful ways. A little knowledge had made the scientific man puffed up and irreligious, much knowledge has again made him an humble believer in God.

But such men can hardly feel themselves satisfied with the present teaching of the Church.

The Ritschlian movement may be the result of one or other of the above causes, perhaps of them all. Such as it is, we can hardly avoid considering it a decided step onward and upward. It by no means discards theology from the list of subjects fit for human speculation. But, in the first place, it distinguishes between religion and theology, and in the second, it proclaims that the supreme and only true source of theology is Christ Himself, and truth to tell, there is very little theology (properly so called) in the teaching of Christ. What others have taught concerns us but little, and has absolutely no weight when in the least degree opposed to His teaching.

From the camp of Agnosticism there has already been heard this objection to the Ritschlian views, "How can any one venture to say with certainty that the four Gospels—that is, the teaching of Christ in them—contains Divine truth any more than, for instance, the writings of St. Paul? You invalidate the one; we require further proofs of the Divine authority of the other."

The Ritschlians are ready with their answer—in fact, it lies very close at hand, and is the only one possible in such cases. They say, "You may require more proofs before being convinced of the Divine truth of the teaching of Christ, but we have none to offer you beyond the one you can find yourselves. There is but one proof convincing to the mind of man in this as in all religious questions. That proof consists in his feeling while reading the words and life of Christ, 'This is Divine truth, this is a Divine life.' Legal proof there is and can be none. In a court of justice this testimony would probably be rejected as worthless. Nay, the entire New Testament would then probably be looked upon as of little or no legal value, seeing that the copies we have received of that book are not only without the signatures of its authors, but also absolutely without any sort of certification as to their being true and correct copies of the original writings; and yet we require no further evidence. We have neither seen nor heard of anything higher being given to the children of men, therefore we accept it as the highest, and thank Heaven, it fully satisfies us."

In this article I have chiefly dwelt on what must be considered as the most important part of Dr. Ritschl's work, his referring us, in our searching for the real truths of the Christian religion, entirely to the teaching of its founder Jesus Christ. But the learned doctor has also written many books on various other important subjects, among them "The Origin and Growth of the Old Catholic Church," "The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation (or Expiation)," "History of Pietism" ("Geschichte des Pietismus"). Dr. Ritschl is very hard upon everything like pietism, which he declares to be absolutely foreign to the evangelical spirit. He says that Luther would have nothing to say to pietism, which is an offshoot of Calvinism, and moreover a Roman Catholic remnant containing an unchristian aversion to the innocent joys and pleasures of this world, a spirit of monklike seclusion and asceticism.

Albrecht Ritschl was born in 1822, and died 1889 as

professor in Göttingen. Among his chief followers may be mentioned Professors Harnack, of Berlin; J. Kaftan, of Berlin; Herrmann, of Marburg; H. Schultz, of Göttingen; Gottschick, of Tübingen; Spitta, of Strassburg; H. H. Wendt, of Jena; O. Ritschl, of Bonn; Loofs, of Halle; Kattenbusch, of Giessen; Lobstein, of Strassburg; Müller, of Breslau; Schürer and Schultz, of Göttingen; Bornemann, of Magdeburg; Gunkel, of Berlin; Handmann, of Basel; Baldensperger and Krüger, of Giessen, with many others, all belonging to the very highest class of German university teachers, both as regards piety and learning. Ritschlianism is, in fact, gaining ground every day, and may already be said to be the dominant religious view at most of the German universities.

In Sweden one of the principal adherents of Ritschl was the late Dr. Fredrik Fehr, "pastor primarius" of Stockholm (something answering to "Dean of St. Paul's" in London). It is already spreading fast in spite of the most violent opposition from some of the orthodox clergy.

Finally, I beg leave to repeat once more the most important fact, that Dr. Ritschl has neither formed nor wished to form any "school" (in the usual meaning of that word in this connection), and that among his followers the utmost diversity of doctrine is discernible. They seem to glory and revel in this spiritual freedom, which certainly is almost unique in the religious or church history of the world. Christ the only supreme teacher, the four Gospels the only absolute authority regarding His teaching (with full and complete liberty to seek truth in the other writers as well), and all to be studied with prayerful turning to the Giver of light for His guidance. All the rest is to be as free as air. Every one to draw his own conclusions, to form his own faith. No rules, no system, no "school," no binding dogmas, and yet every one to have as many dogmas as he pleases. Liberty in everything but *Christian* liberty.

In very truth the world has never yet seen the like. May it succeed!

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN, August, 1896.

THE BASIS OF MORALS.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE G. FINDLAY, B.A.

From *The Expository Times* (Edinburgh), January, 1897.

PART I.

To search through all I felt or saw,
The springs of life, the depths of awe,
And reach the law within the law.

'THERE are two things,' says Immanuel Kant, 'that fill the mind with ever new and increasing admiration and awe the oftener and the more steadily they are contemplated—the *starry heavens above* and the *moral law within*. The former reflexion begins from the place I occupy in the external world of sense, and enlarges my connexion therein to a boundless extent with worlds upon worlds and systems upon systems, and carries me into the limitless times of their periodic motion. The second consideration has its starting-point in my invisible self, my personality, and exhibits me in a world of thought which is truly infinite, and with which I find myself to be in a universal and necessary connexion, no less than with those other visible worlds of space. The former view, of a countless multitude of worlds, annihilates my importance as an animal creature, which, after it has been for a short time provided with vital power, one knows not how, must again give back the matter of which it was formed to the planet it inhabits—that planet a mere speck in the universe. The second view, on the contrary, infinitely elevates my worth as an intelligence, since the moral law reveals in my personality a life transcending my animal nature and even the whole sensible world. For this inward law assigns to my existence a destination that is not restricted to the conditions and limits of the present life, but that reaches into the infinite.'

These lofty words of Kant indicate the greatness of the subject before us, and the point of view from which

we approach it. It is a subject of vital and urgent interest. Never since the days of Socrates has ethical controversy been so radical; never have the assumptions upon which everyday morals rest been so daringly challenged as they are by our contemporaries. This restless and widespread criticism is due to the concurrent action of several causes. In part it is the effect of the vast progress of natural science in recent times—a progress too rapid for the general development of the human mind. We have not had time as yet to digest our splendid discoveries in the realm of matter. Meanwhile we are bewildered by their novelty; and the minds of modern thinkers are dominated and saturated by materialistic ideas. It is no wonder if the leaders of this triumphant march imagined for a while that the universe of knowledge was at their feet, that the frontiers of physical science might be indefinitely extended, that like new Titans they would storm heaven itself and wrest its last secrets from the human spirit. Another cause of moral unsettlement is the rise of Socialism, undoubtedly the most pregnant fact of the half-century now closing. This democratic upheaval is the natural consequence of the development of Christian morals and the popularisation of the instruments of knowledge. The multitude has become enfranchised and audible. The loud, insistent cries of the disinherited awaken misgiving in their brethren, and excite a not unreasonable questioning of the basis of a system that appears to have worked out for many such ill results. A third cause of the disquiet we find in the decay of religion in Europe during the last two centuries—a decadence not prevalent in the British races, but lamentably so in the cultivated nations of France, Germany, and Italy, and due to conditions internal to the Church herself rather than, as many assume, to the advance of secular knowledge and political liberty. These and other conditions of our time are preparing a moral crisis in our Christian civilisation. They are giving birth to momentous conflicts, in which the young men now entering on the field of life will be called to take their part.

The question concerning the basis of morals may be put in two different ways—subjectively or objectively. We may ask, What is there in man that constitutes him moral? what do we mean by morality as an attribute of human nature? Or, on the other hand, What ground is there for morality in the nature of things, in the order and frame of the universe around and above us? The answer to the first question constitutes what is called *psychological ethics*; the second belongs to *metaphysical ethics*. The former method, that commonly pursued by British philosophers, addresses itself to our daily usage and self acquaintance; the latter leads up to the first principles of knowledge, to those primary concepts and fundamental necessities of thought that lie behind our ordinary thinking and govern our mental operations unawares, and which form the subject-matter of the highest and ultimate philosophy. We set out upon the former line of inquiry, asking ourselves what are the facts concerning our ethical constitution, and how are we to interpret them? what has our moral nature to say for itself? But we shall find that those facts point us beyond ourselves. The human conscience is not self-sufficient nor self-explaining. We cannot realise the scope of our own faculties without recognising the existence of a Supreme and Holy Being, in whom humanity has its root. For the microcosm is a mirror of the macrocosm. The psychological question pushed far enough in any direction passes, beyond arrest, into the metaphysical. We cannot stop at subjective phenomena and shut ourselves up within the world of self. When you find a reasoner repudiating metaphysics and pouring scorn upon it, his ridicule usually conceals some particularly bad and shallow piece of metaphysics of his own. We are metaphysicians whether we will or no. The soul cannot conceive of itself without some corresponding conception of the world and God.

But to begin with our moral powers as we exert them day by day. Take the words *good and bad, right and wrong, duty, conscience, the purpose of life*,—terms which cover generally the moral phenomena,—and ask

yourself what you mean by those expressions? what is in your mind when you use them? You call A of your acquaintance a thoroughly 'good' man; B has done a 'worthy and good,' C a 'mean and evil,' deed; Jesus Christ said, 'None is good but one, that is God: ' what do these adjectives signify? Is it that the persons or actions referred to produce certain agreeable or disagreeable effects upon yourself or others? Or do you in so judging impute an intrinsic personal quality to them? The latter is certainly the case. There is no distinction clearer to our minds, none more frequently made or more indispensable in practice, than that which holds between the *pleasant*, or *agreeable*, and the *morally good*. They frequently coincide in the same person or act; and we may anticipate, as a matter of faith, that they will ultimately coincide to a perfect degree, that good people will be altogether pleasant, and right conduct full of ease and joyousness; but this is one of the things that we see not yet. The pleasurable and the good are as completely distinct as any ideas of the soul can be; and no sane mind confounds them in experience, any more than it confounds the ripeness of a fruit with its sweetness, or the harmony of a musical note with the pleasure it conveys. We mean by the term 'good,' applied to a person, the excellence of the person himself as such, or the worthiness of his conduct as the conduct of a human person. While a good horse, good weather, a good ship, a good picture, is so called in virtue of its use or pleasingness, and in accordance with some standard outside the object, a *good man* is such in and by himself, and according to the make of his own being. Personal worth is, for us, the sovereign and standard worth. As Kant says, 'Nothing can possibly be conceived in the world, or even out of it, which can be called good without qualification, except a good will.' Virtue and character, apart from all conditions of fortune and degrees of sensible happiness, are the objects to which we pay unbounded homage. These are the objects that, in our serious hours, we covet supremely for ourselves and for our fellows.

By what is *right* in action or disposition, or *righteous* in character, I suppose we mean the morally good generalised and reduced to a rule. Sometimes, indeed, the good appears to be a larger category than the right, and the good man is placed on a higher level than the merely righteous. But that is only because the finer forms of goodness escape our definition; they refuse to be expressly detailed and prescribed. But the right, as commonly conceived, must be capable of definite inculcation; it is formulated in verbal rules such as the Ten Commandments, the increasing adequacy of such rules being a chief sign of moral development. But we are aware, at the same time, of an absolute law of right that is beyond all codes and definitions, demanding from us an infinite goodness, and urging us on to what the apostle calls 'a perfect man, the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' Thus we rise above moral formulæ to the ideal standard of life, towards which we must be forever striving. Than this righteousness there is nothing more complete or more divine.

In identifying the morally good with the right, however, and in conceiving the right as matter of general rule, it comes to be seen that goodness is no mere individual quality. Virtue is a common human excellence; it belongs to a realm of persons possessing a like nature and associated by a universal law. The knowledge and practice of right are interests of the community; they are incumbent on personal beings in contact with each other. They form the basis of human intercourse, the corner-stone of every commonwealth, the understanding that makes social life possible. When a man does any wrong, he sins against his kind as well as against his own soul—his act injures humanity itself. Righteousness, or Moral Order, is, in fact, the foundation and precondition of society.

This brings us to the grand word *duty*, which is a name for the right and good as it is demanded from ourselves. Duty is morality in action; it is the ethical law coming out of the cloudy abstract, and taking hold of a man's understanding and will and saying,

'Thou shalt.' It is one thing to see the right and to reverence it, but quite another to say, 'I have got to do it.' Now, it is just here, at this practical point, that moral worth begins. 'There is nothing unconditionally good,' says Kant, 'but a *good will*.' While scientific knowledge always has its value as pure knowledge, ethical knowledge, without the desire to actualise it, serves only to reveal the worthlessness of its possessor. 'Ye say, We see,' exclaimed Jesus to the Pharisees,— 'your sin remaineth.' His keen perception and æsthetic admiration of the good in conduct makes the non-doer the more culpable and contemptible. There is no misery like that of the man who 'knows the right and yet the wrong pursues,' who 'with his mind serves the law of God, but with his flesh the law of sin.'

Now, duty implies several things. It implies *freedom of the will*. Without freedom there is no will, no rational activity. 'The will,' says Kant, 'is a kind of causality belonging to living beings in so far as they are rational; and freedom is the attribute of such causality, in virtue of which alone it is efficient and undetermined by foreign causes, just as physical necessity is the attribute marking the causality of irrational beings, which are determined to activity by foreign causes.' It is useless either for theologians or materialists to fly in the face of facts; it is idle for them to deny human liberty, assumed as that is in every personal action, because they cannot reconcile it with their notion of the sovereignty of GOD on the one hand, or with the continuity of natural causation upon the other. Jeremy Bentham declared that 'the word *ought* ought to be banished;' but neither he nor we can get rid of this imperious, and often most uncomfortable, idea. It belongs to the make of the human mind. A young man under a deep religious impression feels that he *ought* to go to China as a missionary: he knows, moreover, that he *must* take ship to get there; and that, to preach to the people, he *must* learn the Chinese language. The two requirements are utterly different—the *ought* of moral necessity and the

must of physical or intellectual necessity. I am bound to love my neighbour : I am bound to think that two straight lines cannot enclose a space. No sort of analysis or explanation can ever reduce the one necessity to terms of the other, or translate the constraint of personal obligation into the compulsion of impersonal force. The 'ought,' in cases of clear duty, is unconditional ; outward difficulties or remonstrances, even the terrors of death, weigh as nothing against it ; it rests only upon one contingency, that of the individual will—the ultimate mystery within us each. The 'must' of natural law, on the other hand, leaves us no alternative : it laughs at our freedom, and enforces instant and unvarying submission. It forbids peremptorily my counting two and two as five, or lifting with my arm a ton weight. But, within the range of personal competence, we are self-directing as we are self-conscious beings, each one of us a burning focus of reflexion and energy, each the author of his own action and the shaper of his own destiny, each invested with the tremendous power of saying in word and deed, to GOD and man, 'I will' or 'I will not.'

Son of immortal seed, high-destined man,
 Know thy dread gift,—a creature, yet a cause !
 Each mind is its own centre, and it draws
 Home to itself, and moulds in its thought's span,
 All outward things, the vassals of its will,
 Aided by heaven, by earth unthwarted still.

Freedom of will is the crown set upon our heads, as men made in the image of the Most High God—a burning crown it may prove, a crushing crown ; but we cannot decline it. Our royalty is limited and perverted in countless ways, but it is inalienable while thought and being last. And with freedom comes *responsibility*, which loses all meaning upon the necessitarian hypothesis. Duty, Freedom, Responsibility, Personality—these are ideas inseparable from each other : their unity makes up our moral being.

A further principal consideration about duty is this : it involves what we have already called in speaking of 'the right,' *a realm of persons*, a kingdom of related

wills. Obligation, synonymous with duty, signifies the bond which links us morally to other beings. Life is a network of mutual duty, a continuous moral tissue, the mystic fabric woven in the loom of time for the wearing of eternity, with all men, of all races and generations, past and present and to come, for its weavers. Duty is our heritage as rational and related creatures—our heritage and our bequest. We are units in an ethical system, a vast connexion of persons—all 'neighbours,' as Jesus understood it. All of us have a moral property in each, and each in all. While duty, then, appeals to freedom, and thus gives us with our responsibility a sense of our individual worth and of the grandeur of our being, at the same time duty subjects us to a boundless world of our fellow-beings; it yokes our freedom to a thousand exacting tasks, and constrains us by love to serve each other. Thus duty unfolds to us the moral universe in which we move and live.

(To be concluded.)

RECENT DISCOVERIES IN BABYLONIA.

BY A. H. SAYCE.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), January, 1897.

(In two parts.)

PART I.

IN Babylonia, even more than in Assyria, England led the way in excavating the buried cities and monuments of the past. To Mr. Hormuzd Rassam, the representative of the British Museum, is due the discovery of the site of Sippara, the ancient city of the Babylonian Sun-god, and of the multitudinous clay tablets with which the library of its temple was stored. For several years a stream of cuneiform documents poured into the British Museum, not only from Sippara, but also from the mounds of other old Babylonian towns. They were mostly deeds and contracts

which threw a flood of light on the social and economical history of the Babylonian people in the days of Nebuchadrezzar and his successors. With their help it became possible to write an account of the social life of the Babylonians, almost as exact and vivid as the accounts which have been written of the social life of ancient Greece.

But England ceased to excavate in Babylonia, and other nations took its place. The Germans explored two cemeteries (at Surghul and El-Hibba) near Shatra, and for the first time showed us how the Babylonians buried their dead. Their excavations explained why it is that the ancient history of Babylonia and Assyria has been recovered from the palaces and temples, and not, as in Egypt, from the tombs. The Babylonians burned their dead, as well as such objects as were interred along with them; the consequence is that the Babylonian sepulchre offers us little except charred and shapeless remains. It is from the temple-libraries, with their vast stores of books inscribed on imperishable clay, that our knowledge of the kingdoms of the Tigris and Euphrates has been, and must be, derived.

The German expedition was on a small scale, and the results were commensurate with its ambitions. It was otherwise with two other expeditions which followed. M. de Sarzec, the French Consul at Basrah, devoted himself to a thorough exploration of the mounds of Telloh in the extreme south of Chaldæa. For years he has patiently worked at the ruins, in disregard of malarial fever and Bedâwin attacks. Gradually a Babylonian city, whose origin is lost in the mists of antiquity, has been brought to light. It was never one of the chief cities of Babylonia; to the last it remained a provincial town. Indeed, its palmy days belonged to the early part of its history, when Semitic princes had not as yet supplanted their Sumerian predecessors or Babylonia been united under the rule of one king. Its Babylonian name was Lagas, and it has yielded an immense number of monuments of all kinds, the most striking of which are the early statues, carved out of hard diorite, which now adorn the Louvre.

But the most valuable of its treasures has been a library, discovered last year. This library contained no less than 33,000 clay tablets, and was formed very nearly 5000 years ago. The larger part of the tablets has gone to Constantinople, where Assyrian scholars are busily working at them. A few have been given by the Turkish Government to the Louvre, and a very large number have been stolen by the Arabs, and are at present being offered for sale in England.

While M. de Sarzec has been working at Telloh, an American expedition has been systematically exploring Niffer, or Nuffar, the ancient Nippur, in northern Babylonia. In my Hibbert Lectures on the "Religion of the Ancient Babylonians" I had been led by a study of the religious texts of Babylonia to the conclusion that Nippur had been a centre from which Babylonian culture was disseminated in what we then regarded as prehistoric times. Thanks to the American excavations, what were prehistoric times when my Hibbert Lectures were written have now become historic, and my conclusion has proved to be correct. Nippur was, in fact, one of the oldest seats of Babylonian religion and civilisation. Its great temple, dedicated to the god called by the Sumerians *Mul-lil* or *El-lil*, "the lord of the ghost-world," was coeval with the beginnings of Chaldæan history. Here the old Shamanistic beliefs of Sumerian Babylonia, which peopled the universe with innumerable spirits, were first organized into an official cult. In later days, when Semitic rulers took the place of the Sumerian princes, and Semitic priests succeeded to the sorcerers and magicians of an earlier age, the Sumerian *Mul-lil* became the Semitic *Bel* or *Baal*, to whom this earth and the underworld were assigned as a domain. The *Bel* of Nippur, however, eventually faded into the background before the younger *Bel-Merodach* of Babylon. When Babylon was made the capital of a united Babylonia, its god assumed supremacy over the other deities of the Babylonian cities, and the older *Bel* was relegated to a subordinate place.

It is among the ruins of the temple of this older *Bel*

that the American excavators have been working. For the first time in Babylonia they have systematically carried their shafts through the various strata of historical remains which occupy the site, carefully noting the objects found in each, and wherever possible clearing each stage away when once it had been thoroughly examined. The work began in 1888, about two hundred Arabs being employed as labourers. For two seasons, until May, 1890, the excavations were continued under the direction of Dr. Peters. The site was surveyed, trial trenches were dug and systematic exploration made in certain places. Among the objects discovered were about ten thousand tablets and inscribed fragments, some of which go back to the earliest epoch of Chaldæan history. Then for three years the work of the expedition was discontinued. But in the spring of 1893 it was resumed more vigorously than ever by Mr. J. H. Haynes. For three full years it was carried on, with an interruption of only two months. What this meant can best be understood by the fact that Mr. Haynes's one European companion, Dr. Meyer, succumbed after a few months to the pestilential atmosphere of the Babylonian marshes, and during the rest of the time Mr. Haynes was left to fight single-handed against fevers, and Bedâwin, and all the usual difficulties which attend excavations in the Ottoman dominions.

As Professor Hilprecht says: "It was indeed no easy task for any European or American to dwell thirty-four months near these insect-breeding and pestiferous Affej swamps, where the temperature in perfect shade rises to the enormous height of 120° F., where the stifling sand-storms from the desert rob the tent of its shadow and parch the human skin with the heat of a furnace, where the ever-present insects bite and sting and buzz through day and night, while cholera is lurking at the threshold of the camp, and treacherous Arabs are planning robbery and murder; and yet during all these wearisome hours, to fulfil the duties of three ordinary men."

But the task was at last accomplished, and the ex-

cavations at Nippur were carried deeply and widely enough not only to reveal the history of the city itself, but also to open up a new vista in the forgotten history of civilised man.¹

The history of civilisation has been taken back into ages which a short while since were still undreamed of. Professor Hilprecht, the historian of the expedition, upon whom has fallen the work of copying, publishing, and translating the multitudinous texts discovered in the course of it, declares that we can no longer "hesitate to date the founding of the temple of Bel and the first settlements in Nippur somewhere between 6000 and 7000 B.C., possibly even earlier." At any rate the oldest monuments which have been disinterred there belong to the fifth or sixth millennium before the Christian era. Hitherto we have been accustomed to regard Egypt as the land which has preserved for us the earliest written monuments of mankind, but Babylonia now bids fair to outrival Egypt.

The earliest fixed date in Babylonian history is that of Sargon of Akkad and his son Naram-Sin. It has been fixed for us by Nabonidos, the royal antiquarian of Babylonia. In one of his inscriptions he describes the excavations he made in order to discover the memorial cylinders of Naram-Sin, who had lived "3200 years" before his own time. In my Hibbert Lectures I gave reasons for accepting this date as approximately correct. The recent discoveries at Niffer, Telloh, and other places have shown that my conclusion was justified. We now find that the Babylonians from the earliest times kept a register of the successive years of each king's reign, marked by the chief event or events which had characterised them, so that it was easy for future historians to draw up chronological lists of the Babylonian kings and determine the number of years they each had reigned. It was also usual on the death of a king to devote a single tablet in this way to the chronology of his reign, and at times, when

¹ Professor Hilprecht calculates that more than 32,000 inscribed tablets were found there.—"The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania," I. 2, pp. 8, 9.

one dynasty was succeeded by another, a chronological record of the fallen dynasty was compiled, the years being reckoned by the events which had occurred in them, and the whole number of years during which the dynasty had reigned being summed up at the end. These lists can be tested by the contract-tablets, of which we now possess many thousands, and which are dated in the way I have just described. What particular event should be considered as characterising a particular year must have been determined by official authority.

Take, for example, one of the chronological tablets found at Niffer, which was written immediately after the death of Pur-Sin II., one of the last kings of the third dynasty of Ur. This was the dynasty which preceded that to which Amraphel, the contemporary of Abraham, belonged. The tablet begins as follows: (1) "The year when Pur-Sin became king; (2) The year when Pur-Sin the king invaded the land of Urbillum; (3) The year when the great throne of Bel was made." And so the tablet continues down to the end, where we read: "The year when Gimil-Sin became king of Ur and devastated the land of Zabsali" in the Lebanon. In the contract-tablets which have come from the excavations at Niffer and Telloh we find these selfsame dates expressed in precisely the same words.

We can, therefore, no longer refuse to believe that Nabonidos had quite sufficient chronological materials for assigning a date to Sargon of Akkad and his son. We may henceforth tranquilly accept the fact that the date of these two kings is as far back as 3800 B.C.

But this is not all. Assyriologists have long had in their possession a cuneiform text which contains the annals of the reign of Sargon, and of the first three years of the reign of his son. It is a late copy of the original text, and was made for the library of Nineveh. Our "critical" friends have been particularly merry over the credulity of the Assyriologists in accepting these annals as authentic. We have been told, only so recently as last year, that the reputed age of the annals would alone show them to be fictitious, and that

Sargon and Naram-Sin are alike unhistorical.¹ Unfortunately it is more dangerous to be sceptical in matters relating to Babylonian history than it is where certain other old Oriental documents are concerned, as, thanks to the excavators, monumental evidence may at any moment turn up, which even "critical" ingenuity is unable to explain away. And so it has happened in the present instance. So far from being unhistorical, Sargon and Naram-Sin prove to have come at the end of a long-preceding historical period, and the annals themselves have been verified by contemporaneous documents. The empire of Sargon, which extended from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, was not even the first that had arisen in Western Asia. And the art that flourished under his rule, like the art which flourished in Egypt in the age of the Old Empire, was higher and more perfect than any that succeeded it in Babylonia.

A broken bas-relief has been found at Diarbekir in Northern Mesopotamia on which is engraved a figure of Naram-Sin, accompanied by an inscription recording his deeds. It is the finest and most delicately executed specimen of Babylonian art that has come down to us, and reminds us by its realism and finish of the early sculpture of Egypt. The most exquisitely worked of Babylonian seal-cylinders is one that was made in the reign of Sargon; it represents, so far as we know at present, the highest point attained by the gem-cutter in the ancient Oriental world. And along with this perfection of art went a similar perfection in the cuneiform system of writing. Numerous monuments have been brought to light of the two kings whom German criticism so recently pronounced to be *unhistorisch* and the writing upon them shows that the cuneiform script had already reached its full development. The forms of the characters have lost all resemblance to the pictorial shapes we can still trace in the earlier inscriptions, and the limits and methods of using the syllabary have been defined once for all.

¹ Carl Niebuhr: "Chronologie der Geschichte Israels," p. 75; "Geschichte des Ebräischen Zeitalters," p. 41.

Between the cuneiform script of Sargon or Naram-Sin and that of Nebuchadrezzar there is comparatively little difference; between it and the script of the early texts which have been found by Haynes and de Sarzec there lies the difference between the writing of a child and the writing of a grown-up man. Henceforward, Sargon and Naram-Sin, instead of belonging to "the grey dawn of time," must be regarded as representatives of "the golden age of Babylonian history."

That they should have undertaken military expeditions to the distant West, and annexed Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula to the empire they created need no longer be a matter of astonishment. Such campaigns had already been undertaken by Babylonian kings long before; the way was well known which led from one extremity of Western Asia to the other. The "higher criticism" has informed us that the conquests of Sargon in Syria and Palestine were the inventions of a later date; now, however, inscriptions of Sargon himself have been discovered which are dated in the year when he led his armies into "the land of the Amorites." The trustworthiness of his annals, which I have urged again and again, has been strikingly vindicated, and historical scepticism must find some other record of antiquity on which to expend its strength.

It is Mr. Haynes who tells us that we are henceforth to look upon Sargon of Akkad as a representative of "the golden age of Babylonian history," and his assertion is endorsed by Professor Hilprecht. In fact, the conclusion is forced upon both the excavator and the palæographer. Professor Hilprecht, who, thanks to the abundant materials at his disposal, has been able to found the science of Babylonian palæography, tracing the development of the cuneiform characters from one stage of development to another, and determining the age of each successive form of writing, has made it clear to all students of Assyriology that many of the inscriptions found at Niffer and Telloh belong to a much older period than those of the age of Sargon. The palæographic evidence has been supplemented by the results of excavation. A pavement

has been found among the ruins of the temple of Nippur, composed of enormous bricks, some of which are stamped with the name of Sargon, while others bear the name of his son Naram-Sin. The two kings rebuilt the temple of the god, and Naram-Sin also surrounded the city with a second or outer wall fifty two feet in width, the lower part of which still remains. Above their pavement is a mass of *débris* rather more than eleven metres in height, the topmost layer of which is coeval with the Christian era. It needed, therefore, the accumulations of nearly 4000 years to raise the mound eleven metres. But below the pavement Mr. Haynes found 9.25 metres of the *débris* of older buildings, and when it is remembered that this older *débris* had to be levelled down before the pavement of Sargon could be laid upon it, we may gather some idea of the antiquity to which the lowermost remains reach back. It would seem that the temple of Mul-lil must have been founded at least as early as 6000 B.C.

And yet, as far back as we can penetrate, we still find inscribed monuments and other evidences of civilisation. It is true that the characters are rude and hardly yet lifted above their pictorial forms. They have, however, ceased to be pictures, and have already become that cursive script which we call cuneiform. For the beginnings of Babylonian writing we have still to search among the relics of centuries that lie far behind the foundation of the temple of Nippur.

The first king whom the excavations there have brought to light is a certain En-sag (sak)-ana who calls himself "lord of Kengi" and conqueror of Kis "the wicked." Kengi—"the land of canals and reeds," as Professor Hilprecht interprets the word—was the oldest name of Babylonia, given to it in days when it was still wholly occupied by its Sumerian population, and when as yet no Semitic stranger had ventured within it. The city of Kis (now El-Hymar) lay outside its borders to the north, and between Kis and Kengi there seems to have been constant war. Kis was aided by the Semitic nomads of Mesopotamia, "the Land of the Bow" as it was termed, whose Bedâwin inhabitants are the Sittiu,

or "Archers" of the Egyptian monuments. A time came when the Semitic hordes succeeded in forcing their way into Kengi, and it may be that Professor Hilprecht is right in thinking that before the days of En-sag-ana they had already established a kingdom of their own at Erech in southern Chaldæa. However this may be, Nippur was the religious centre of Kengi, and Mul-lil, the god of Nippur, was the supreme object of Sumerian worship. The culture which emanated from Nippur had not yet united with another stream of culture which flowed from the city of Eridu on the Persian Gulf.

En-sag-ana was not the only king of Kengi who had overcome Kis in battle. Another king had done the same, and had even captured the ruler of the hostile city. The statue of the vanquished prince, his store of silver, and the furniture of his palace were all dedicated by his conqueror to the god of Nippur. In the inscription accompanying the gift the king of Kis is entitled "king of the hosts of the Land of the Bow." It is plain, therefore, that the king of Kis claimed sovereignty also over the Bedâwin "Archers" of the north.

It was not long, however, before Kis more than redeemed its discomfiture. A king of Kis made himself master of Nippur and its sanctuary, and the old kingdom of Kengi passed away. The final blow was dealt by the son of the Sumerian high priest of the "Land of the Bow." Lugal-zaggi-si was the chieftain who descended from the north upon Babylonia and made it part of his empire. In gratitude for his victories he lavished gifts upon the great sanctuary of Mul-lil. Among them were large vases of delicately-carved stone, upon which was engraved a long inscription of 132 lines commemorating his exploits. Fragments of more than 100 of these vases have been disinterred at Niffer, and the inscription upon them has been patiently pieced together by Professor Hilprecht, almost at the sacrifice of his eyesight. This is how the founder of the earliest Asiatic empire known to us begins his story :

"To Mul-lil the King of the Universe, Lugal-zaggi-si the king of Erech, the king of all the world, the prophet of Anu, the supreme priest of Nidaba, the son of Ukus high-priest of the Land of the Bow and supreme priest of Nidaba, he who has been regarded with favour by the faithful eye of the King of the Universe, the great high-priest of Mul-lil, unto whom intelligence has been granted by Ea, he who has been called by the Sun-god, the supreme minister of the Moon-god, he who has been invested with power by the Sun-god, the fosterer of Ninna, the son begotten by Nidaba, he who has been nourished with the milk of life by Nin-Kharsag, the priest of Umu, the chief priest of Erech, the slave brought up by Nin-a-gid-khadu the mistress of Erech, the supreme interpreter of the gods. When Mul-lil, the King of the Universe, invested Lugal-zaggi-si with the kingdom of the world and granted him victory before the world, when he filled all lands with his renown, and subdued them from the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun, at that time he directed his path from the Lower Sea of the Tigris and Euphrates to the Upper Sea, and granted him the dominion over [all things] from the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun, and caused all countries to dwell in peace."

It is strange to listen for the first time to this voice from a remote past. Lugal zaggi-si lived centuries before Sargon of Akkad in days which, only a year ago, we still believed to lie far beyond the horizon of history and culture. We little dreamed that in that hoar antiquity the great cities and sanctuaries of Babylonia were already old, and that the culture and script of Babylonia had already extended far beyond the boundaries of their motherland. The inscriptions of Lugal-zaggi-si are in the Sumerian language, and his name, like that of his father, is Sumerian also; yet the nomad "Archers" over whom he ruled can hardly have been other than Semites; and in my Hibbert Lectures I have given reasons for holding that the city of Erech must once have been the seat of a Semitic power. If so, we shall have in the name and inscriptions of Lugal-zaggi-si a further proof of the profound influence exercised by the culture of the Sumerians upon the rude Semitic tribes who lived in the neighbourhood of Chaldæa. Not only the script of Babylonia, its language and religion also had been adopted by the ruling classes of the nations that surrounded it. The condition of things which has been revealed to us by the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, when the Babylonian syllabary and language were the common medium of inter-communication throughout Western Asia, had been

anticipated centuries before. The only difference was that, in the age of Lugal-zaggi-si, the language of Babylonian culture which was thus spread through the Oriental world was the old agglutinative Sumerian, and not the Semitic Babylonian of a later day.

It is clear, from the inscription of Lugal-zaggi-si, that he was the founder of a veritable empire. His father was merely the high-priest of the Semitic population of Mesopotamia, like Jethro, "the priest of Midian," or the "priests of Assur," who preceded the earliest kings of Assyria. But he subdued Babylonia, the centre and seat of Asiatic civilisation, making himself master of its sanctuaries, and establishing his capital at Erech, which henceforth in the Sumerian script of Chaldæa bore the proud title of "The City." With the resources of Chaldæa at his back he was able to march westward even as far as the Mediterranean Sea. As he tells us, his dominion stretched from the sunrise to the sunset, from the Lower Sea or Persian Gulf to that Upper Sea where the sun sank to rest. Throughout western Asia all countries obeyed him and he carried the elements of Babylonian civilisation to the farthest bounds of Syria.

Babylonia was benefited by the conquests of its new lord. With the spoil that poured into it from distant lands, the walls of Ur were raised "high as heaven," and the temple of the Sun-god at Larsa was enlarged.

THE PAPAL BULL.

BY SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), January, 1897.

THE Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* has been sharply criticised from the Anglican side, the critics not seeming able to decide which is its most unintelligible shortcoming, the brutality which could offer so gratuitous an affront, or the folly which could betray such ignorance of elementary facts. There are others, perhaps, who find it hard to believe that a kind-hearted Pope like Leo XIII.

can have wished to give unnecessary offence, or that one who certainly possesses talent and adequate means of information can have perpetrated blunders of an elementary kind. Such persons are asking whether these hostile critics do not labour under some misconception. They may be interested, therefore, to hear what a Catholic writer who has paid some attention to the subject has to say about the Bull.

And, first, as to the reasons which moved Leo XIII. to institute the recent inquiry, and to announce its result. Lord Halifax has himself told us, on more than one occasion, how, some two years since, he fell in with a certain French priest, and discussed with him a topic of much interest just now—the healing of the divisions of Christendom. Naturally they considered chiefly the possibilities of reunion between their own respective Churches, and they agreed to act together, each endeavouring to influence the members of his own communion, and to work for the accomplishment of the desirable end. Lord Halifax seems then to have proposed that the question of Anglican Orders should be placed in the forefront of the movement. He represented that the members of his communion could tolerate no project of reunion which did not presuppose the validity of its Orders, whilst, at the same time, they were all firmly convinced that the only reason why the Roman Church at present treated these Orders as invalid was because it had never candidly and competently examined their claims. It may be that Lord Halifax did not express himself precisely in this language, but no reader of his article in the *Nineteenth Century* (May, 1896), can deny that his representation amounted to this. Neither, therefore, can it be denied that the goal toward which the Halifax-Portal movement tended was to induce the Pope to act in the matter; nor, in view of the widespread interest in the movement taken and expressed by Anglican prelates, statesmen, clergy, and laity, that the Pope was justified in regarding the applications made to him as emanating from an important section of the Anglican body.

We may think that these reunionist leaders were a

little wilful in attaching themselves to impossible ideas ; but we English Catholics can surely view only with sympathy the motives, and to a large extent the character, of their action. Still, since they did act in that way, does it not follow that no wish to offer them a gratuitous affront, but rather the desire, and a singularly earnest desire, to meet their aspirations with justice and sympathy, is discernible in Leo XIII.'s institution of the commission, as well as in his promulgation of its result ?

An exercise of Papal authority reversing the practice of three centuries was solicited, and a commission of inquiry was indispensable. The validity of a certain class of disputed Orders is a point which cannot be determined in the *ante-camera*, or even in the *camera*, by following the impulses of a kindly feeling. And the few encouraging words spoken by cardinals and others to Mr. Lacey, of which he tells us in his article of last month, can only have been intended as expressions of hope or anticipation. They certainly could not have been allowed to pledge the Holy See to a particular course. The question raised was one of theological and historical truth, and its determination could only be left, in the first instance, to the issue of a learned and impartial inquiry, and afterward to the judgment of the Pope thus scientifically informed. And if the commission was indispensable, nothing could be fairer, or more calculated to bring out the truth, than the mode of its constitution. First, a commission of experts was appointed for the collection of materials, and on this the advocates of either side were represented in equal numbers. These were directed to begin by investigating apart in their own countries, where they could have access to the local sources of information. They then met together at Rome, and, in a series of sessions, submitted their facts and arguments to the refining fire of mutual attack and defence. At this stage they were, moreover, allowed access to all such relevant documents as could be found in the Archives of the Inquisition and the Vatican. The materials thus scientifically prepared, with the full apparatus of criti-

cisms and counter-criticisms appended, were now submitted to another commission of a judicial character, formed out of cardinals attached to the Holy Office. These cardinals were themselves trained theologians and canonists, and they were further assisted by skilled consultors. They were thus as competent a court of inquiry for such a question as could be anywhere obtained, and they will have understood perfectly well, even if they were not expressly reminded of the duty, that it behooved them to disregard all considerations of expediency, and judge solely by the evidence.

Their judgment, we know, was unfavourable to Anglican Orders, but when reached it had still to undergo a further process of reconsideration. Leo XIII., when his own personal authority is to be exercised, always insists on going through each point for himself, and satisfying himself of its correctness. Thus every argument, every line, every phrase in the *Apostolicæ Curæ* is truly his, and those who assure the English public, as if they knew, that it was drawn up in England, and was forced upon the Pope, who signed it with reluctance, are merely advertising their own untrustworthiness of judgment.

The Bull itself tells us, that even after the final decision had been reached by the Pope, a delay of six weeks was prescribed that he might carefully and prayerfully consider with himself the desirability of giving it to the world. He had been told that a promulgation would cause much pain to Anglican Churchmen, and he was anxious to consult their feelings to the uttermost. At length, however, he determined that it was a duty to publish, and we can understand why. After an inquiry which had been solicited in the way above described, and which had been watched with so general an interest, to withhold the publication of its result would have been a measure lending itself to serious misconstruction. And, indeed, though Leo XIII. probably did not think of this, can we doubt but that, if the result of the inquiry had been suppressed, the self-same critics who are now so indignant with him for

not suppressing it, would have been equally loud in their denunciations of the "traditional Roman spirit" which can never say out frankly what it means?

This account of the course and motives of Leo XIII.'s recent action is incontestable, and indeed the Bull itself, in language of the most conciliatory kind, bears witness to its correctness. May not one hope, then, that Anglican Churchmen, when they have had time to reflect, will, even if unable to recognise the conclusiveness of his arguments, give Leo XIII. credit for his kindly and sympathetic spirit? He has done all he could, short of violating conscientious convictions, to meet their aspirations after reunion, and it would be unreasonable to require infidelity to conscience as the only convincing test of friendship.

Now about the contents of the Bull, or rather about a certain portion of them, for it will be necessary to pass over what it says about the previous practice of the Church in dealing with Anglican Orders; and of the decision of 1704, in the Gordon case, I have only space to say (1) that it is known to have been most thorough, and is not, therefore, likely to have indulged in the unsatisfactory reasoning of which Mr. Lacey suspects it, and (2) that, this decision notwithstanding, the question was reopened in the recent investigation, and, contrary to what Mr. Lacey suggests, independently studied. The Bull itself attests this: "Although the controversy now resuscitated was long since settled by the judgment of the Apostolic See . . . nevertheless *we ordered that a fresh examination of the Anglican Ordinal, on which the question mainly turns, should be made with the greatest care.*" To suggest that, so long as the previous settlement was held to be binding, it was antecedently impossible to hold an independent inquiry, is to substitute Cartesianism for sound philosophy. And, as a matter of fact, I know that the new inquiry was made, with great thoroughness and independence, and with an adequate knowledge of what has been said or written on the subject.

But, insists Mr. Lacey, how can there have been an independent and competent inquiry when the text of

the Bull shows traces of the contrary? It contains extraordinary blunders, and passes over without notice the new and important arguments which form the present lines of Anglican defence.

Perhaps I may claim, without presumption, to know all that Mr. Lacey knows about the various matters of theology and history bearing on this question. I know about the history of the Roman and Anglican rites respectively; I know about the Oriental rites, including the Abyssinian, and the ancient rites, including the so-called Hippolytean; I know about the Bull of Eugenius IV., about the discoveries of Morinus, and about the alleged decree in the Abyssinian cases of 1704 and 1860; I know about the theological questions as to the tradition of the instruments, the imperative or precatory character of the sacramental form, and the sufficiency of a "general intention to do what the Church does;" I have read the works of Dr. F. G. Lee and Mr. Bailey, the more recent works of Mr. Denny and Mr. Lacey himself, the writings of MM. Portal, Duchesne, Gasparri, and Boudinhon, in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* and elsewhere, and the more fugitive utterances of Mr. Lacey, Mr. Fuller, and the Bishop of Stepney, on the Bull itself. I have read and studied all these and more besides, and yet can say unreservedly that I find in the Bull no traces whatever of the blunders and suppressions or omissions which are said to be so conspicuous in it. It does not, I know, discuss all the points on which the defenders of Anglican Orders rely. Why should it? It is a Bull, not a theological treatise; and Bulls, like Acts of Parliament, give, at most, outline statements of the grounds on which their prescriptions rest. All detailed discussions which have been considered in the preparation they leave over to be either filed and preserved, or, if published, to be published in a less authoritative way. There is nothing, however, that I can find in the Bull to show that the points which Mr. Lacey has in mind have been left out of account. Certainly, there is nothing in it to show that its compilers were unaware of the comparative simplicity of ancient forms, of the Holy See's dealings

with Abyssinian Ordinations, of a recognised sufficiency in the minister of a sacrament of a "general intention to do what the Church does," of the context, and particularly of the preface, of the Anglican Ordinal.

What the Bull does is to go at once to the roots of the question, and ask if the Anglican rite fulfils even the most fundamental and certain requirement of a valid rite. As it answers this question in the negative it had no need to enter into other matters. There is a dispute, we know, in this country between the High Churchmen and the Low Churchmen as to the meaning of their ordination rite. Does it purport to convey a sacrificing priesthood? "Certainly," say the High Churchmen. "Certainly not," rejoin the Low Churchmen. "Cranmer did not intend by his manipulations to extrude the idea of a sacrificial power from his rite," say the High Churchmen, "or, if he did, he did not succeed." "Cranmer both intended and succeeded in extruding this idea," rejoin the Low Churchmen. "The rite contains clear indications that the idea was retained," say the High Churchmen. "The rite contains the clearest indications that the idea was extruded," rejoin the Low Churchmen. What the Pope does in effect is to disagree with the High Churchmen and agree with the Low Churchmen. An ordinal to be valid, he says, should purport to convey a sacrificing priesthood. This purports not to convey it. Therefore it will not do. In the major premise of this syllogism he has the High Churchmen more or less with him. In the minor premise he has the Low Churchmen with him. Each of these parties accepts one premise but not the other; the Pope accepts both. Really there is nothing else in the Bull, although it naturally casts its reasoning into a somewhat more scientific form.

The essential elements in a sacramental rite are distinguishable into the *matter* or ceremonial action, and the *form* or words accompanying the ceremonial action. All the other parts of the rite are subsidiary. They are valuable in assisting us to understand better the nature of the gift imparted, but they are not neces-

sary. About the matter of the Anglican rite the Bull says very little. Imposition of hands is, according to by far the most probable opinion, the only ceremonial action required, and, as the Anglican rite failed to pass the test of a sufficient form, its omission of any tradition of instruments did not need to be examined. What then was deemed to be its defect of form?

Here an important principle needs to be borne in mind, and I call attention to it the more insistently because it is the neglect to observe it which has caused the argument of the Bull to seem so fatuous. Sacramental words according to Catholic doctrine—and of course it is Catholic doctrine which the Bull applies—are words of power. They resemble the words which our Lord employed to still the waves,¹ to heal the leper,² to forgive sins.³ Such words must signify the effect wrought through their instrumentality. Words without an apposite signification would be unseemly for such a purpose, and the signification in virtue of which they are operative is not any signification, or meaning, of which they are in themselves capable, but that particular signification, or meaning, which the speaker intends by them. The power is not in the words apart from him, but in him and in his message infused into them. Hence, to apply this principle, we cannot take the words of an ordination service apart from the signification, or meaning, or intention (these terms are all synonymous) of the person who employs them.

By the person who employs them may be meant the person who administers the rite, the corporate person or Church which imposes it, and the compiler who originally made it. We may, however, confine attention to the last of these three, since the person administering, unless irrational, should intend what his Church intends by her language, and the Church is presumed to have accepted her rite in the sense intended by its framers, particularly if these were her own chief officers. Thus, to return to the Anglican rite, if

¹ Matt. viii. 26.

² *Ibid.* viii. 3.

³ *Ibid.* ix. 2.

one desires to judge of its validity, it is necessary to take its words not in any sense which they can bear, but in the sense of Cranmer and his associates who undoubtedly compiled it and imposed it on the Anglican Church. And this is just what the Bull does.

But here Mr. Lacey breaks in triumphantly. Your procedure, he says, is to interpret the form of the rite by the intention of its framer, while, as you know very well, you can only infer the nature of this intention from the nature of the rite.¹ I am a little surprised that Mr. Lacey should object thus. I am told that he has in his time been a schoolmaster, whereas a master's—a classical master's—art may be said to consist in teaching pupils to do precisely that which he now calls arguing in a circle. The Gospel tells us that our Lord was clad in a purple robe. Probably Mr. Lacey would have explained to his pupils that, by “purple,” the sacred writer intended “scarlet;” or, if he were expounding the “Ecclesiastical Polity,” and came across the phrase, “the poor and silly estate in which the Apostles had lived,” he would probably have pointed out by “silly” Hooker intended “simple,” not “foolish.” Or, to leave alone schoolmasters, if in the *Church Times* he were to read an advertisement inquiring for a “Catholic” governess, would he not conclude that a High Church member of his own communion was intended by the advertiser, although if he had found precisely the same words in the *Times*, he would have assumed that a member of my communion was meant? This point seems really too simple to require explanation; since, however, it must be said, let it be said that we infer the intention of the speaker primarily from the words he uses on the occasion, but if these words are not by themselves sufficiently definite to certify us of his real intention, we have recourse to other tests. We assume that he will have wished to speak consistently with his otherwise expressed opinions, and we seek these either in his context, proximate or remote, or else in his other writings. Or we assume that, de-

¹ *Contemporary Review*, December 1896, p. 796.

siring to be understood, he will have intended his words in the sense in which they would have been taken by those to whom they were proximately addressed, and we seek elsewhere to learn what this sense may have been.

Let us see, then, how the Bull applies this very rational principle. It begins by laying down what a valid ordination rite should signify. It should signify "the Order of the priesthood, or its grace and power, which is principally the power of consecrating and offering the true body and blood of the Lord by means of a sacrifice which is not a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross." This is in conformity with Catholic doctrine. An office or order should be signified or described by what is primary, not by what is derivative in its functions. That is to say, the signification of the former is essential, the signification of the latter may be dispensed with. Now, the Catholic Church holds that in the ministry of her priesthood the earthly work of our Blessed Lord is continued. While on earth (1) He redeemed us by His Sacrifice on the Cross ; (2) He taught us to know the fruits of His redemption by His preaching ; (3) and He imparted these fruits to His followers. Similarly, in the continuation of His work by the Church's ministry, we distinguish (1) the Sacrifice of the Mass, which is a true sacrifice of commemoration, not a bare commemoration of a sacrifice, and in which the merits of the sacrifice of the Cross are pleaded with God ; (2) the preaching of the Gospel, together with (3) the administration of the sacraments, whereby the benefits derived through the Sacrifice of the Mass from the Sacrifice of the Cross are proclaimed and imparted to men. But it will not be denied that our Lord's Sacrifice on Calvary was the primary element of His priesthood ; and in like manner, according to Catholic doctrine, the power of offering the Holy Mass is primary in the Catholic priesthood.

Now, the Bull lays down that this sacrificial power must be definitely signified by the Ordination form ; but I cannot find that it requires the words of the form

to contain *within themselves* an explicit mention of this power. There is a difference between definitely signifying and explicitly mentioning. The phrase "*la reyne le veult*" makes no explicit mention of the legislation which it sanctions, but it signifies it, under the circumstances in which it is uttered, with sufficient definiteness; no one can mistake what is intended by it. The principle expounded above must not be forgotten. What is of value in words of power is the meaning infused into them by their author, and the nature of this meaning may be ascertainable with definiteness only through the aid of such extrinsic tests as context, the author's language elsewhere, the sense in which his proximate hearers would have understood him. So far from disputing the applicability of this principle, the Bull actually applies it. First, it takes the words of the Anglican form, "Take the Holy Ghost," etc., in the rites for the priesthood and episcopate as they were in 1559; it decides that they do not *of themselves* definitely signify the power of sacrifice, and who can say that they do? Even so the Anglican rite separates itself from every other which the Catholic Church has ever recognised. For in all these cases the commissioners had evidence to show that the order conveyed was expressly named in the form itself.¹ Still the Bull does not insist merely on this; it goes on to consider what light on their intended meaning can be derived from extraneous sources. The clauses added in 1662 it dismisses summarily. Whatever be their value, great or little, they were added too late to be of avail. It weighs, however, the interpretative force of "the other prayers of the same Ordinal," a phrase which is evidently meant to include all else in the rite to which appeal has been made by its defenders. In these prayers and ceremonies it is several times stated that the candidates are to be made into bishops, priests (or deacons). So farewell, but what did the framer mean by these terms? Did he mean bishops and priests in the Catholic sense—sacrificing bishops and priests—or did

¹ See *Civiltà Cattolica*, Dec. 19, 1896.

he mean ministers appointed only to the conduct of purely external rites? Was he retaining the ancient meaning along with the ancient names, or was he retaining the names but changing the meaning?

Here, if nowhere else, we may feel certain that Leo XIII. perceived a decided parting of the ways between the Anglican Ordinal and such an Ordinal as the Abyssinian. Were it true that the latter does not explicitly designate the priestly order, as, in fact, it does¹ in the form for the priesthood, there can be no doubt what it means, even according to the mutilated form given in the "*Historia Æthiopiæ*": "Look down on this Thy servant and bestow upon him the spirit of grace and the counsel of holiness, that he may rule Thy people in integrity of heart." In Abyssinia, as elsewhere, the ordination rite is incorporated in the Liturgy of the Mass, thereby signifying in the most unmistakable manner that its purport is to create priests and bishops who may take their parts in the celebration of the divine mysteries. Thus the meaning of the Abyssinian form can be interpreted from the Abyssinian Liturgy, and no one can read that Liturgy, as it is given in Renaudot or Hammond, without recognising its strongly marked sacrificial character.

On the other hand the prayers which make the context of the Anglican form—together with the rite for administering the Lord's Supper, with which it is somewhat loosely associated—instead of determining the ambiguity of the form to a sacrificial meaning determine it to the exclusion of such a meaning. How then, asks the Bull, can we gather from these contextual prayers that the meaning intended by the authors and imposers of this rite was the conveyance of a sacrificial priesthood, when pains had been taken to cut out of it every phrase which involved that construction? And how, again it asks—passing from the consideration of the context to the consideration of the general character of the Reformation movement, as evidenced by the writings and actions of its leaders—how can we

¹ See *Civiltà Cattolica*, Dec. 19, 1896.

suppose that people like Cranmer and Ridley intended by the words *Take the Holy Ghost* to express the conveyance of a true sacrificial priesthood and episcopate, when they were never tired of abusing the Mass, and even went so far as to destroy all the altars in the land that it might never be offered upon them again? This argument will probably commend itself to most English readers, nor will they perceive any weighty counterpoise to it in the retention of the terms "priesthood" and "episcopate" in the other prayers, or in the protestation of the Preface that it was intended to retain the triple order as it had come down from the "Apostles' time." The truth is, it was desired to retain these ancient terms after having eviscerated them of their ancient meaning, because to discard terms with which the Primitive Church was so familiar would have been too suicidal. And they protested in the teeth of facts that they were continuing what the Apostles had handed down, not so much because they intended to hold what the Apostles held, as because they wished to believe that the Apostles held what they held.

This is the place to acknowledge that Mr. Puller, in a recent tract on the Bull, has tried to prove that the authors of the Ordinal did mean to preserve the Eucharistic Sacrifice, by citing certain passages from the writings of Cranmer, Jewel, Bilson, Field, and Andrewes. I have no space to discuss these passages now, nor is it necessary. Although, as they appear in Mr. Puller's pages, they may seem to claim a Eucharistic Sacrifice for the Anglican Church, they will not bear verifying. In every case the context shows the kind of sacrifice they had in view to be something very different from that in which the Catholic Church believes, and something of comparatively trifling importance.

A few words are likewise all that can here be given to the *defect of intention* which the Bull indicates as a second source of invalidity in Anglican Ordinations. The intention here meant is the intention of the minister who uses the rite, not of the author who compiled

it. This intention, says the Bull, if we are to judge from external indications and presumptions, has been throughout inadequate. An Anglican would reply that ministers of his Church have presumably intended always "to do what the Church does," and that this, if we can trust approved Roman theologians, is enough. But it is on this very point that the Bull joins issue. It says that "to do what the Church—that is, the Catholic Church—does," is precisely what Anglican Bishops have not intended. What the Bull means is this. When a Church draws up a rite, it intends through its administration to do some sacred action, and her minister can in that case act in her name, and intend to do by her rite what she intends to do, or have done, by it. But if, instead of using her rite he uses another which she never drew up or prescribed, and indeed one which was drawn up in downright defiance of her wishes, he cannot intend to do by it what she intends, for the simple reason that she does not intend to do by it anything at all. Now this is the case with those who administer the Anglican rite. They can intend, and if they act rationally will intend, to do by it what the Anglican Church does by it—that is, make Protestant pastors of the higher, middle, or lower degree—because it is her Ordinal, she prescribes its use, and this is her intention in reference to it. But they cannot intend to do by it what the Catholic Church does by it, because the Catholic Church intends to do nothing whatever by it. Her attitude toward it is to forbid all who will listen to her voice to have anything to do with it.

The Bull *Apostolica Cura*, to be fully understood, requires many more words of explanation than these. Perhaps, however, what has been said in this paper will suffice to disabuse some of those who have been led to suppose that the Pope's object in issuing it has been other than conciliatory, or that its composition bears traces of the strangest ignorance and incompetence.

One more word. Mr. Lacey, in his article last month, discussed the chances of the Bull being at some

future time either openly or at least tacitly repudiated. He assured us that even Papal infallibility is not held to cover statements of fact—so that if at any future time the facts on which its decisions rest should be proved false, the decisions can be withdrawn without difficulty. This is an altogether erroneous impression. No theologian of any standing would allow that infallibility cannot cover dogmatic facts. There can be no doubt that the Bull is irreformable. Its language and the circumstances of its publication have been manifestly chosen with the express object of making it irreformable, and irreformable it will remain. If reunion can never be until it is withdrawn, reunion will never be. We may be permitted, however, to hope for a more favourable contingency.

THE THEOLOGY OF WALTER PATER.

From *The British Weekly* (London), December 31, 1896.

As we have more than once had occasion to say of late, the alienation between literature and the Church is at last recognised as a serious and formidable fact. And the idea has gained currency that if large parts of the Christian dogma could be abandoned or thrown into the shade, the result would be a religion acceptable to the cultured. If it were so, our duty would in no wise be changed. We should still have to declare *all* the counsel of God. We should still have to say, "I have received of the Lord that which I deliver unto you." Otherwise preaching descends to the level of speech-making. But we have steadily maintained that it is not so, that a volatilised Christianity has no more attraction for the man of letters than it has for the rest of mankind. A very striking proof of this may be found in a curious little volume of which 100 copies only have been printed for private circulation. This contains nine reviews contributed to the *Guardian* by Mr. Walter Pater. Mr. Gosse, we believe, has edited the volume, and that distinguished critic correctly says

that though the positive value of the essays may be slight, they are of value and interest as proceeding from Mr. Pater. It seems to us that they are of very eminent value in helping us to understand the exact theological position in which he finally rested. It is quite superfluous to say that Pater was an ideal exponent of the culture of his day.

In "*Marius the Epicurean*," his most elaborate and living book, Mr. Pater enforces and enlarges the philosophy of his work on the renaissance. It is expressed in few words: A counted number of pulses is given us of varied dramatic life. We have an interval, and then our place knows us no more. Our business is to expend that interval in getting as many pulsations as possible into the given time. This might be called Epicureanism; the author calls it New Cyrenaicism. When the glamour of youth dies away, something more is needed than this philosophy of moments. Life seeks pathetically for continuity, for what lasts and binds, and can be handed on from soul to soul. That continuity it finds in the ancient and wonderful ethical order which is in impregnable possession of humanity. The crystallised feeling that is stored in the world's moral belief attracts the seeker for pleasure. Pleasure is not to be found, as he first thought, in the violation of this moral order, but in submission to it. His sceptical attitude may be, and indeed is, still maintained. Morality may have no absolute virtue or validity, but obedience is a source of pleasure and quickening faculty to the individual. It will be seen that we have advanced to morality, but not beyond Epicureanism. A further step is taken towards religion, and it is in the same direction. Christianity may not be true, but it is best to treat it as if it were. True Christian feeling gives brightness and sweetness to life and mitigates the awfulness of death. Christianity enshrines much of the most heroic and noble feeling and utterance of the human spirit. Therefore it is wise to take it on trust. The intellectual citadel should be kept inviolate. You may think, if you please, with the elect who are the small minority. But you will be wise to

give yourself at the same time to the prayers and tears and dreams of the majority. In this way the sweetest, most elusive, most delicate flavour will be given to life, and death will lose something of its terror. Marius, who in reality died but a half Christian death, was generously recognised as a martyr in times when martyrdom was taken as a kind of sacrament with plenary grace.

In his unfinished last book, "*Gaston de Latour*," Pater goes further. His editor, Mr. Shadwell, says that the book was to be a picture of a refined and cultivated mind, capable of keen enjoyment in the pleasures of the senses and the intellect, but destined to find its complete satisfaction in that which transcends both. The final expression of Pater's mind in this book has been well summed up in the text, "I have seen that all things come to an end, but Thy commandment is exceeding broad." The utmost limits of the new ways are reached, and the restless and immortal spirit pursues its quest further and finds its large room in the commandment. It was stated, though not very prominently, when Pater died, that he had been for years a professed believer in Christ, and we owe much gratitude to Mr. Gosse for giving us the proof of this, and for indicating the lines on which Pater advanced beyond his Epicureanism. The most interesting passage is perhaps that in which he deals very courteously with Robert Elsmere. "We have little patience," says Pater, "with the liberal clergy who dwell on nothing else than the difficulties of faith and the propriety of concession to the opposite forces." He goes on to say: "As against the purely negative action of the scientific Ward, the high-pitched Gray, and the theistic Elsmere, the ritualistic priest, and the quaint Methodist, Fleming, both so admirably sketched, present perhaps no unconquerable differences. The question of the day is not between one and another of these, but in another sort of opposition, well defined by Mrs. Ward herself, between two estimates of life, the estimate which is the offspring of the scientific spirit, and which is forever making the visible

world fairer and more desirable in mortal eyes, and the estimate of St. Augustine.' To us," Pater goes on, "the belief in God, in goodness at all, in the story of Bethlehem, does not rest on evidence so diverse in character and force as Mrs. Ward supposes. At his death, Elsmere has started what to us would be a most unattractive place of worship, where he preaches an admirable sermon on the purely human aspect of the life of Christ. But we think there would be very few such sermons in the new church or chapel, for the interest of that life could hardly be very varied when all such sayings as 'Though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor,' have ceased to be applicable to it. It is the infinite nature of Christ which has led to such diversities of genius in preaching as St. Francis, and Taylor, and Wesley." Again, in his essay on Amiel, he criticises Amiel's religion, and says that his profoundly religious spirit might have developed "had he been able to see that the old-fashioned Christianity is itself but the proper historic development of the true "Essence" of the New Testament. Assenting on probable evidence to so many judgments of the religious sense, he failed to see the equally probable evidence that there is for the beliefs; the peculiar direction of men's hopes, which complete those judgments harmoniously, and bring them into connection with the facts; the venerable institutions of the past, with the lives of the saints. By failure, as we think, of that historic sense of which he could speak so well, he got no further in that direction than the glacial condition of rationalistic Geneva." It is that very Genevan rationalism which is ever and anon being recommended as the specific for our ills, but Pater saw that if any powerful part of Christianity is accepted, it involves the rest, and that ultimately the witness of all the saints, and not the mere experience of the individual, is to be relied upon, for it was to the saints that the faith was first of all delivered.

We go back on another typical figure of the world of culture, one who never, like Pater, completely surrendered his unbelief. Clough, whose inexplicable

attraction, notwithstanding the small amount of his enduring product, continues, left a fragment belonging to the last period of his life, on "The Religious Tradition." Most readers know something of his hard battle with moral and intellectual perplexities, from the time when he went to Oxford, and was for two years, in his own words, like a straw drawn by the draught of a chimney, on to his premature death. But his later years, if they were not filled with the strange, unearthly peace which is the final token of Christ's indwelling, were much more quiet than the earlier. He had begun to see that it was not his business to construct a religion or a theology, or to achieve his own salvation. He began to recognise, though dimly, that these things were the work of another. In his last writings he laid emphasis on the significance and depth of the moral and religious teaching which passed by the name of Christianity, and wrote that "implicit reliance cannot be placed on the individual experience, reason, judging power." Therefore, he says, "I see not what alternative any sane or humble-minded man can have but to throw himself upon the great religious tradition." His opinion on a pared-down, accommodated Christianity is seen in the words: "I contend that the Unitarian is morally and religiously only half educated compared with the Episcopalian." So it comes at last that the wisest begin to doubt themselves, begin to see how little way their individual faculties carry them, discover that Christianity is not a new thing, but that for all these centuries the Spirit has interpreted the Word to the hearts of believers. They accept some word of God-guided men, prove it in their own experience, and then, even if their experience tarries behind, they trust the inspired leader and go on with him. They have lost the desire to construct a new path to Heaven; they are content to take the way which the saints have trodden, the way that leads to the Fountain.

We should like to say a word, in conclusion, about Balzac. A reference was made to him, in a recent article, as the greatest of Christian novelists. Some

correspondents have written to question this, and to point out the immoral character of much that he wrote. Now, it is quite true that Balzac's novels are not for everybody, and that many of them, perhaps most, should be kept out of the hands of the young. He was the greatest of those who have explored the subterranean ways of life and set in a terrible lustre the secret things of darkness. His books are full of the tremendous pursuit of retribution, of the slowly gathering coils of fate, of the mysteries of pain and shame lying under the thin surface of life. His characters are haunted by thoughts of the past, by hopeless hopes, by devouring recollections, and he shows us—and this perhaps is his greatest achievement—that these things are to be found no less in the quiet woods and fields than in the crowded city. We will steadily refuse to say that this literature, when done grandly, has not its place and use. It brings home, as few things do, the sense of human sinfulness and human misery, and in many passages of Holy Scripture the same method is used to produce the same result. Indeed, we believe that if the Christian Church is to recover its old power, it will be in recoiling from the shallow optimism which refuses to put aside the silken curtains and see what is behind. The question of Balzac's greatness as an artist is one of criticism, and we should think few competent judges will deny that he is incomparably the finest of French novelists, and indeed the first novelist, with one exception, of the whole century. Nor must it be forgotten that he himself, notwithstanding his long, pitiful struggle, was one of the friendliest, gentlest, and kindest of men. Few records are more touching and noble than the collection of his letters, and we have dwelt again and again, with deep emotion, on many passages—on his filial love, on his invincible courage, on his impatience of the materialistic creed, on the heroism with which in his rainy garret he went on year after year without encouragement, doing his very best. And, above all, where shall we find such a story of pure, tender, delicate devotion as that of his fifteen years' love, or a more pathetic epi-

sode than his death, after but three months of the long-awaited happiness? That Balzac was free from follies it would be ridiculous to deny, but how much of passionate affection and devotion lay behind them! That a large part of his work had better not have been written is equally clear. When in the end of the day death set the doors open and let the sun shine in, the closet of this man, who had drawn such pictures of the skeleton in every closet, was found empty. We have not space to make quotations, but where in the literature of fiction can one find so complete an exposition of remorse and expiation as that, for example, in his book, "The Country Pastor"? His great intellect and noble heart rested devoutly on the experience of the saints. He found no difficulty in the humble acceptance of the Christian creed, and one can imagine what scorn would have awakened in him by the gaunt and forlorn structure which is dressed out and set forth among us anew as the Christian faith. How often, even in his least ungenial writing, when he seems abandoned to the spirit of cynicism, does his faith flash up and drive it out of sight! There be those who, with Matthew Arnold, still hear the melancholy, long withdrawing roar of the sea of faith as it steadily retreats and leaves the barren shingles naked. Others, more wise, hear the wave of joy and hope that is to lift the world coming nearer and near.

A METROPOLITAN CHURCH.

From *The Christian Register* (Boston), January 14, 1897.

A MAN who was standing before a building of anomalous architecture in New York asked a passer-by, "Is this a circus or a synagogue?" As a matter of fact it was neither, but a Christian church. The stranger who stands before St. Bartholomew's Church in New York, or sees the picture of it printed on the title-page of its Year Book for 1896, will have no doubt that it is a church. Its cross-bearing tower rises high above

the roof ; it suggests aspiration and worship. But this is not only a house of God : it is a house of man. If the stranger had nothing but the contents of the Year Book before him, he might be as much puzzled about its interior activities as the stranger was by the exterior architecture of an up-town church. Here are some of the curious entries which figure among the reports :—

Tailor shop.
Penny Provident Fund.
Employment Bureau.
Kindergarten.
Afternoon Club.
Athletic Team.
Bicycle Section.
Surgical Clinic.

Fresh Air Work.
Sewing school.
Loan Bureau.
Parish Press.
Evening Club.
Baseball Team.
Medical Clinic.
Chinese Guild.

Such entries as these are not common in church year books. Some of them would puzzle our fathers not a little : they would not know the meaning of the baseball team or the bicycle section in the church ; and, if they knew what these terms meant, they might shake their heads still more. And what would the early Christians have said about a church "race-track"? To an old Greek, accustomed to go to Olympia, worship first in a temple, and exercise in the *stadion*, it would have been all right. But the entries above are only a number of the long list of reports which make up this volume, and we have purposely picked out some of the more unusual. Evidently, this church does not merely exist for the pleasure of its members ; and, if its athletes would dispute Paul's statement to Timothy that "bodily exercise profiteth for little," they would agree with him that "godliness is profitable for all things."

St. Bartholomew's Church, of which Rev. David H. Greer, D.D., is pastor, is an illustration of what a modern metropolitan church may be. The change which distinguishes it from the church of fifty years ago is not in worship, but in parish work. The worship of this church is carried on according to the forms of the Episcopal Church. The sermons from its pulpit

are full of life and spirituality. The really marked change is in parish work. As Dr. Greer says in his preface: "It is a very comprehensive term, and has come to mean and include very many things. Formerly it meant chiefly, if not exclusively, the making of pastoral calls. That is now its least considerable part. The function of a parish, as it is now apprehended and exercised, is not to live for itself or to work for itself, by a series of activities directed upon itself, but to live and work for others. That, at least, is what we are trying to do in this parish, or that is what we are trying to make the parish do,—to live and work for others."

Just how well St. Bartholomew's Church succeeds in doing this may be seen in the three hundred and thirty-seven pages which make up its elaborate Year Book. It is a remarkable exhibition of how the functions of worship, philanthropy, moral and intellectual and physical education, social development and business enterprise, can all be conjoined in the life and activities of a Christian church. In addition to the church building, there is a large and admirably equipped parish-house. There are schools, auxiliary chapels, an Oriental mission, a rescue mission. The Pentecostal character of the work of the parish is seen in "the different tongues in which this parish is preaching the gospel," illustrated in this Year Book by the "Apostles' Creed" printed in English, Chinese, Turkish, Armenian, Swedish, and Syriac. A loan bureau aids the temporary distressed. There is an employment bureau, a kindergarten, mothers' meetings, not to speak in detail of work for the Indians, the Mexicans, men's clubs, boys' clubs, girls' clubs, Sunday-schools.

It takes money "to run" such a church. The receipts from all sources in the last year were \$167,131.53, of which \$119,693.25 were offerings and donations, and \$47,202.60 from pew rents. Of this money \$118,331.71 was spent for objects in the parish, and \$40,974.54 for objects outside the parish. This is a large sum of money to administer every year. But that it is con-

ducted on business principles is shown by the fact that there is a balance of \$7,825 28 on hand.

Such a church must not only have money, but men and women. Strong as Dr. Greer is, it would break his back to bear the whole load ; so he has five assistant ministers, and, exclusive of wardens, vestrymen, ushers, and other church officers, a large corps of lay-workers, some of whom necessarily give their whole time to the work committed to them. The time when a minister can be expected to do all the work of his church in a great city, or even in a small one, has passed. Nothing but the consecration of the time, wealth, and service of the pews, as well as of the pulpit, can fulfil the mission of the city church to-day.

There is danger, to be sure, that, in the independent development of the activities of a city church, there may be some overlapping, some clashing. Sectarianism may be introduced into benevolent work. Work may be assumed by the church which might better be done through the Associated Charities ; and sometimes such work is not done on business principles. The loan bureau, however, of St. Bartholomew's church is an example of charity applied to business and business applied to charity. It loans money on more reasonable terms than is granted by extortioners, but it insists that its clients carry out their part in the agreement with absolute promptness and fidelity. " It is a purely business organization, founded by business men, incorporated by the legislature, and intended to loan money to parties who, while having a fair income, find there are occasions when there is a sudden call for from \$50 to \$200 for immediate use." A great many of the patrons are young business men, lawyers, and salesmen, who secure money in emergencies for loans of their household furniture on which they make regular monthly payments. During the last year this bureau has made 733 loans to the amount of \$39,331 ; 840 loans have been paid in full, and \$40,075 the principal received. The fees amounted to \$2,026.64. These figures show that the loan bureau does its work on business principles.

St. Bartholomew's Church is not the only one in New York which is radiating light, warmth, and cheer in that city. St. George's Church, of which Dr. Rainsford is pastor, is working on somewhat similar lines; and there are other churches well equipped and earnest and effective. But it is evident that the original Saint Bartholomew might well be proud of the church which bears his name, and might undoubtedly learn from it a good many things about church administration which he and his brother apostles did not know. Whatever difficulty this early Congregationalist might have had in following this Episcopal service and in understanding the "Apostle's Creed," he would find the heart of the gospel in Dr. Greer's sermons.

THE CHURCH IN AMERICA.

ITS RELATION TO THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF THE PEOPLE.

BY THE REV. S. D. McCONNELL, D.D.

From *The Churchman* (New York), January 23, 1897.

IN his book on the "American Commonwealth," Mr. James Bryce, the English statesman and historian, has a most interesting chapter upon the religious life of the American people, and draws a very interesting comparison between our religious life and that of the people of France, Germany, and Great Britain. He does not hesitate to say that the diffused religiousness of this country is distinctly greater than is to be found in France and Germany, that it is possibly about equal with that in England, while not so intense as in Scotland. Then he proceeds to make the observation that the religion of the people of the United States has certain very striking and peculiar characteristics of its own, though it is of course Christianity, and though its institutions are very much the same as are to be found in other portions of the Christian world. Though its confessions and creeds are very much the same, nevertheless, he points out with great distinctness that

it has a sort of general character peculiar to itself, and he confesses it is a most difficult thing to define in what the American characteristics of religion consist. Now, this brings me in a general way to the statement of the theme which has been given me to discuss to-night in the course of these conferences upon the American Church; and in reference to its title I speak of it as simply the Church, because it is an awkward thing to be perpetually speaking of The Protestant Episcopal Church. In calling it the Church, I do not wish to be claiming for it the exclusive right of that title, although I believe it has more claim than is possessed by any other religious body. I wish to speak to-night of the influence of the Church in general upon the institutions of this country; not to trace its growth in the United States, but to attempt to trace out its actual influence upon the actual current religious life of the American people.

The people of America are Christians, the religion of America is Christianity; because many of them, the greater part even, are outside the Church, we must not call them heathen. It is for us to say to-night whether the Church has any real influence upon life in America, in what that influence consists, and how it manifests itself; this is the problem we have to solve! American life may be compared to a broad, moving river, fed by affluents which stream into it from a thousand quarters; even so the religion of the United States has come to it from very many sources. Of course when the rivers flow into the broad stream, the waters become merged, they lose their distinctive characteristics, and are no longer to be distinguished except in rare cases, as when the water is marked by some peculiar color which continues visible for a long period, as in the case of the Blue Nile, the waters of which can be traced for five hundred miles, and also one of the affluents of the Great Amazon River which can be distinctly seen side by side with the broader stream for an immense distance. Now, this is true to some extent concerning the religious influence which has come to this country with people from foreign

lands. In many cases they are wholly merged and their identity lost ; but in some we can distinctly trace their influence and effect upon our nation ; in others, again, nothing less than a chemical analysis can trace them.

There are only three organizations, which have gone under the name of Churches, which had their origin in the United States. One of these calls itself the Christians, and has its membership chiefly in the Middle and Western States ; the second is the sect of the Mormons, and the third the Reformed Episcopalians. These three, as far as I am aware, are the *only* denominations of American birth ; all the others have had their birth in foreign lands. Now this is our question : these various religious influences have come here, and have flowed together in the same current, and mingled with one another, and how far, if at all, has the Church to which we belong affected the conclave of this great stream ?

In order to see this, let us make a brief historical survey. I was surprised when my thoughts turned to this subject in preparing for my lecture to-night, to discover how there has been absolutely no attempt made in this country to trace the influence of any one of its denominations on all the rest. Every denomination has had its history written, but almost entirely the history confines itself exclusively to its own denomination and makes no attempt to weigh the result of its action on any other or upon the whole movement of thought. This renders very difficult the task, which, before I undertook it, seemed to be very easy. I discovered, however, that the material had not only to be put into shape, but actually created. In order to see the influence of our Church, it is necessary to make a brief historical survey of the religious history of the people of the United States. It is very difficult for us to realize that two-thirds of our history lies in the period before the Revolutionary War. We have a sort of vague way of taking it for granted that our whole history lies within the last century, that nothing much of consequence occurred before the war. It is true,

when one considers the events that have occurred since the Revolution, and contrasts them with what happened before, that the later occurrences are larger, but when one is tracing the origin of things, he finds that a very large part has to be sought for in the days antecedent to the Revolutionary War.

Look, then, at the religious purposes and habits of thought which the earliest settlers in this country brought with them. We may divide these roughly into three groups : first, those colonies settled in Maryland and Virginia by Church of England people. They were all Church and State people who brought with them the inherited customs of more than six hundred years of Anglo-Saxon Christianity. In their thoughts the connection of Church and State was inseparable. The people who settled these colonies were simple little groups of members of the Church of England who emigrated and sat down again on this side, changing none of their habits intentionally. Of course, as time went on, many were compelled to change their ways of living, but their idea was to settle down here and reproduce the habits to which they had been accustomed on the other side. One thing was characteristic of them—the emphasis they laid on the connection of the State with the Church ; they emphasized the civil side rather than the ecclesiastical.

The next group were the New England colonies, beginning with Connecticut. I think we are prone to forget that the Puritans were all Church of England people. Their earliest clergy were of English origin, just as much as those of Virginia, and at first they had no intention whatever of severing their connection with the English Church ; their first project of colonization started with the benediction of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and their clergy were ordained in the Church of England. They were Church and State people, too, and they attempted to reproduce the same habits of thought and life, but they differed from the Southern colonists in that they laid the emphasis on the Church, not upon the State. They decided that the

Church, not the State, should regulate their institutions.

The third group of colonies included the settlers in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, and these colonies were settled under very different auspices and with very different methods. They were pure ventures of commerce, the people were entirely commercial and their Church differed from the other colonial Churches. They had no idea of the identity of Church and State, though they had not thought out very well just how a Church could exist in a country where it had no relation to the State. . . .

So far as doctrinal beliefs were concerned, the people of these colonies, whether Dutch, French, or English, were all more or less Calvinists. The type of doctrine held by these settlers was almost universally Calvinistic. The Puritans were all High Churchmen, their Churchmanship differed a little, but they were the highest that have ever been, the highest of all High Churchmen; they laid great stress upon the Church as an institution, and though they differed among themselves as to what was the true Church to which each one should subscribe, they had one thing in common, the universal detestation of what they called enthusiasm and experimental or emotional religion.

This was the foundation of the religious life of the United States. Since then there has flowed into it streams from every source, people from every tribe under heaven, and to this we must not forget to add the influence of pagan tribes. Now we have increased to seventy millions of people, and the result has been apparently utter chaos, I mean religious chaos. On the political side, order was brought out of the chaos very early, but on the religious side, as one looks around, he is not surprised that Mr. Bryce found himself perplexed as to the characteristics of American Christianity. Now out of this is very slowly being formed the American Church. For the most part its foundations are deposited like those of the coral islands, far out of sight, but it is certainly having its founda-

tions laid and its character formed, though the work progresses very slowly.

The first thing to be noticed is the seeming lack of coalescence of the ecclesiastical bodies which have come to this country. Some have existed for two centuries and are yet as completely untouched by other denominations as though they lived in the heart of Central Africa. Take, for instance, one of the smaller Presbyterian branches of the Church, known as the Scotch Covenanters, an organization of some sixty or seventy congregations. It has continued to exist in the midst of all movements, and yet is apparently as absolutely untouched by them all as if they had lived all their days in some obscure glen in the Highlands, and this is not peculiar in standing aloof. There is another branch of which I wish to say a word now, because I propose to leave it out of our consideration afterward, and that one is the Church of Rome. I propose to leave it out for this reason, because while it is perfectly clear that the Church of Rome has been influenced itself by the atmosphere of the United States, influenced far more than its members suspect, influenced to such an extent that it can never be here what it is in any other country, it lies so far outside the Church life of this country or, I should say, perhaps, the Protestant life, that it need not be discussed. I believe none of us know anything more about the religious life of a Roman Catholic than we do about a Buddhist. These two classes of men lead their lives so remote from others, keep their religious lives so far apart from others, that I think it is quite possible for two men to be intimate friends for a number of years and yet for each to have no conception of the religious life of the other. Mr. Hutton is not far wrong when he declares that Romanism and Protestantism are so different from one another that neither can at all enter into or comprehend, or sympathize with the religious life of the other. For this reason, I think it well to leave out this great branch of Roman Catholicism altogether, simply because it is so little influenced by, and

has so little influence upon, the religious life of the American people.

Now we shall discover when this nation began to be a nation, the first task set before it was to disentangle the Church from the State. It seems very easy for us to think of a free Church existing independently in the midst of a free State, side by side, neither encroaching, neither asking aid from the other. This has come to seem so simple that it is with great difficulty we realize how impossible that mode of thought was to one of our own great grandfathers! At the end of the war they had to undertake a task which had not been done for sixteen hundred years, from the time when Church and State were fused together under the Emperor Constantine. There was not a single instance of a Christian Church existing that had no relation with the kingdom. During the whole history of Christianity, the Church and State were bound together; now the task was laid upon the people of disassociating them. It is very much easier to separate outward and visible things than it is to tear apart two things which have lain side by side in our thoughts. There are still some areas where Church and State still coalesce, still some strange survivals of their union to be found in some of the States. In North Carolina, for instance, no Roman Catholic can hold office, and in the constitution of the State of Virginia no infidel or obscene person can hold office; but for all practical purposes the separation is complete. So far as our own Church was concerned, it was compelled to do, as the result of the Revolutionary War, what all the other Protestant bodies had the opportunity to do at their leisure. Our Church during the period of the Revolutionary War was part and parcel of the British Constitution, it has itself torn loose by the result of the war. By the providence of God, this Church of ours was compelled to be the pioneer in that process of separation between ecclesiastical and civil things, and she has gone further than any other religious organization in the world. But now, when the religious life of the people became free to take its own course, there were three points of crys-

tallization possible. You must not forget that in this great heterogeneous mass of Christian people there were all types and races to be found, English, Scotch, Irish, Germans, French, all thrown in here together, shifting along without form until after the war it began to show symptoms of a national organization.

You know if you deposit in a vessel a liquid saturated solution of certain chemicals, it will immediately begin to take the form of crystals; without the chemicals, it will remain vague and formless. Now in the first half century of the Republic there began to show points of crystallization around which has been centred the religious life of this country. These three divisions correspond to the emotions, the intellect, and the conscience. The first group crystallizes round the intellect. It is made up of the various bodies of Christians known as Lutherans, Congregationalists, Presbyterians. For their constitution they have Confessions of Faith or Consensus, they formulate certain doctrines which they approach through the understanding, their candidates for membership are examined as to their intellect—"Do you *know*?" The second group, the emotional side of religion, finds its first representation here in the Baptists, the Methodists, and later on, in the Salvation Army. They have all one thing in common, they all revolve around this idea of feeling. The question asked their candidates for admission is "Do you *feel*?" The third group is that of the ethical side of Christianity, the conscience; that is made up of the Church of England and the Moravians. It laid its stress upon conduct. It did not ask, like the first, What do you believe? or like the second, What do you feel? but simply, "How do you live?" It would not be fair to say that the doctrinal group laid no stress upon righteousness of life, but it is perfectly fair to say that this Church emphasizes the conduct of life above the others.

This was the situation from 1790 to about 1825, and thus things stood when the wave of revivalism (that strange chapter of history) swept over the whole country from Maine to Georgia; from 1810 to 1840, the

whole country was simply swept with the enthusiasm of the emotional revivalists. The Presbyterians made a firm stand against it, they prayed against it, preached against it, argued against it; but, for the most part, they, too, were swept away in the stream of enthusiasm.

In this country, the one Church which has persistently, from the very beginning, set its feet steadfastly upon the ethical side of the question, the only Church which has constantly stood there has been our own, and it is this which has given it its characteristics, and from this point we shall have to take our stand in order to see the influence she has had upon the religious life of the people as a whole. The Church has stood before the nation as her conscience dictated. I do not mean to say she has disregarded doctrine, but the thing for which she has stood from first to last is right living, that Christianity is primarily righteousness of life, that Christ came on purpose to make man righteous, to lift him up gradually but surely out of sin. Our Church has always looked with more or less doubt upon any new doctrine, she has always been shy of telling her experiences, but she has always insisted upon right living. For this she has suffered many things; she has opposed many things because of their taint of worldliness, she has been called all sorts of names, nevertheless she has held steadfastly on her way. The purpose of the Gospel of Jesus Christ is to save men from sin now, the question of hell will come when they get there, and the Church concerns herself with saving them *here and now*. We must get this clearly before our minds. This is her final attitude, and it can be shown clearly by a few and simple considerations.

This conception determines her conditions of membership in her organizations. When a man comes to be admitted into the Church, the priest is only permitted to ask him two questions; the first is, "Do you believe all the articles of the Christian faith?" and the second, "Do you promise by the help of God to walk according to God's commandments all the days of your life?" The man who says yes, has the right of mem-

bership; he makes these two vows with a clear conscience; then membership comes to him as a matter of right, he comes to claim his own. And that this is the position of the Church may be seen in a very crucial way. The central act of her worship is the Lord's Supper. How does she receive, and how does she repel, those who come to it? First, how does she receive? "Ye who do truly repent, etc." How does she repel? "If any be an open and notorious evil liver," etc. That is how she takes her stand from first to last upon the ethical side of religion; she approaches the question of Christianity primarily through the conscience, not through the understanding, or the emotions. Now this is the key to the influence which she exercises, far beyond her members, and wealth, upon the religious life of the people. The efficacy of her sacraments she insists upon. She knows it is far more difficult to live rightly than to feel rightly, and so she insists upon the routine of sacraments which belong to her. She has been the first Church in the world to give laymen a co-ordinate place with clergy in her councils. The Presbyterians seem to have done the same thing, but remember that the elders are not laymen, but ordained men; the Methodists followed her example years after in admitting laymen to their councils. Why does our Church do so? Because, according to her conception, the Church has to do with life, with every-day affairs, therefore she assumes that the every day man is better qualified perhaps than the recluse to deal with things pertaining to daily life. Our Church is often accused of not having any doctrine. She has the Apostles' Creed, and this position she takes intentionally, because she believes that the Church should approach man through his conscience, not his intellect. Now by what means does she impress this thought on the heart of the people of the land? And to what extent? As far as one can see, the whole movement of religious life is *not* to her as an organization, but toward those characteristic waves of thought which concern this Church of ours. First of all, you have only to read the newspapers to see the

increasingly rapid breakdown of belief in the systems of theology such as the Augsburg Confession. Little by little these great statements of doctrine are disintegrating, are becoming obsolete, people are going away from them. Why? Simply because the whole thought of modern, American, religious life is toward that same altitude which our Church takes her stand upon, and has done so for more than a hundred years. What has caused this movement toward our position? Principally the Spirit of Truth. We do not believe that we have a monopoly of the Spirit of Truth. Much has been caused by the actual presence of our Church in this country: men have seen her, and I think we are more watched than we are aware of. There is a deference and attention given to our Church out of all proportion to her size, magnificence, or wealth, caused principally because she is a teaching Church.

Then there are influences in literature, sources where you would hardly look for Church teaching. Whoever reads Shakespeare becomes predisposed to be a Churchman, not consciously, but simply because of the pervading influence of the English Church upon the minds of her children. Whoever reads Tennyson, or Browning, or the English novelists, whoever saturates himself with Kingsley, must be influenced, as all English-speaking people are, toward the Church of England. They are not aware of it, the writers are not aware of it, but the background of English literature is the English nation, part of which is the English Church; and whoever reads them is influenced unconsciously by it. Not to speak of the "Christian Year" of Keble, or of Coxe, but of literature in general, the whole attitude of mind, the underlying assumption, if one may so say, the *sub*sumption tends to bring men to the Church. Then English theology. If you go into the library of a Presbyterian or Methodist, you will find the books most used are those by English Churchmen, and how can one estimate the influence of Phillips Brooks through his writings, to bring men into friendly feelings toward the Church? Now by these means this influence has been spread, and it brings us into a

place where the responsibility of comparing ourselves with others becomes a matter of transcendent importance. Our contribution to the Church of the United States—what shall it be? Not its people. The people are not with us. The principal idea before the Church to-day is that of Christian unity. We are ready to meet our brethren, to talk the matter over with them, to do our share even to the extent of losing all for the building up of the Church of America, and if in that organization ours should disappear it will be but as individual stones are lost in the building of some great edifice. The people of the United States are already Christians, they will take from our hands, provided we have to give to them; they are restless, dissatisfied, uneasy. This discontent is our opportunity to do that special work in them, for them, for which God has led us up to this point by so strange and chequered a path.

IAN MACLAREN'S CREED, AND WHAT SOME CLERGYMEN THINK OF IT.

From the *New York Herald*.

As reprinted in *The British Weekly* (London).

VIEWS OF THEOLOGIAN'S ON ITS POWER, PLACE, AND PURPOSE IN CHRISTIAN UNITY—IT HOLDS THE TRUTH—BUT TO SOME MINDS IT FALLS SHORT OF EMBODYING THE ESSENTIALS OF CHRISTIANITY.

"I BELIEVE in the Fatherhood of God. I believe in the words of Jesus. I believe in the clean heart. I believe in the service of love. I believe in the unworldly life. I believe in the Beatitudes. I promise to trust God and follow Christ, to forgive my enemies and follow after the righteousness of God."

The above words, taken from the first chapter of "The Mind of the Master," have come to be generally known as "Ian Maclaren's Creed." This creed, which is an attempt upon the author's part to set forth a platform upon which all believers in Christ, of whatever denomination, or sect, or of no sect at all, for that mat-

ter, can stand together, is the subject of much talk at the present time, and has met with the opposition of some staunch churchmen, who believe that dogma is an absolute necessity to the wholesome Christian life.

But it was to do away with dogma altogether that Dr. Watson devised his creed. He recognises the tendency of the times.

"The spirit of our day," he says, "is so resentful of traditionalism as to be even impatient of theology, which is foolish, and to threaten faith, which would be ruin."

So he argues the foolishness of dogma, and endeavours in this creed to get back of all human creeds to the words of Christ Himself, those uttered in the Sermon on the Mount, for a ground upon which all can meet, even those believers in Christ who refuse to accept the doctrine of any church, of whom, he intimates, there are many in these days.

But some object. Sermons have been preached against the creed.

It is simply a creed of ethics, say some, very good in its way, but not a practical creed to build churches on.

Dr. Watson has anticipated the objection, and in the same chapter that embodies his creed calls attention to the fact that it was the only creed of the entire Christian Church during its three first and most important years—those when Christ Himself taught on earth.

The controversy is general, and for the purpose of bringing out facts and opinions, the *Herald* here publishes the views of some of the foremost ministers of the day upon "Ian Maclaren's Creed."

HEBER NEWTON APPROVES.

Ian Maclaren's creed is an admirable summary of the essentials of religion. I can scarcely imagine any one objecting to it. Of course, it is not an exhaustive statement of the Christian belief. It is not proposed as such. It therefore does not offer itself as a substitute for the old creeds.

An exhaustive statement of Christian belief is, however, not particularly in demand at the present day.

It bears upon its face an evidence of knowing too much altogether. If agnosticism has done nothing more, it has at least taught the Church the wisdom of reticence before the inscrutable mystery of life. Man knows too much now to think that he knows everything. Only a fool will undertake to prate about the mysteries concerning which every man, woman and child in days gone by babbled so freely. All creeds are undergoing a process of natural shrinkage. It is an age of condensation. As we have condensed foods for the body, so we are condensing creeds for the soul. As a condensed creed, I think this statement of the genial Scotchman most admirable. It leaves any one free to believe a great deal more, if he can. But it recognises all who believe thus much as essential Christians. It bases fellowship upon character rather than intellectual conceptions.

So it is an immense stride in advance upon hosts of the so-called creeds of the churches. It is a good working creed—and that is about all that the present age asks of a creed.

You will see that for one, therefore, I do not expect this simple statement of belief to be accepted by the churches, in councils assembled, as a substitute for the old creeds. Yet it is quite within the range of possibility that, in the recognition of such a simple statement by hosts of Christian people as the essential faith, there should come to pass a recognition of the common Christianity in all the churches.

NO CREED, SAYS DR. HALL.

In reply to your letter asking my opinion regarding "Ian Maclaren's Creed," I beg to say that it is a good expression of devout feeling, but it does not seem to be a "creed" in the sense in which that word has been used for many centuries. A "creed" is a definite statement of what is believed by the community identified with it; and it is supposed to embrace the doctrines which are essentially important, or which it is believed to be proper to affirm in the condition of the time, or the place.

Suppose, for example, that the Reformers had issued a creed such as this, what distinct form would Protestantism have assumed?

There are radical truths which have been denied or assailed—such as the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, His atonement by dying, the need of being born again, the pardon of sin when Christ is trusted, the need of the Holy Spirit's sanctifying power—which are found in the Protestant creeds all over the world, which are properly there, but which are not formulated in the above statement.

I write "formulated," for the very first statement is ambiguous. There are those who rest the "Fatherhood of God" simply upon creation, in which sense it would include fallen angels. The "Fatherhood of God" is realised through new creation. "As many as received" Christ "to them gave He power to become the sons of God" (John i. 12).

The Sermon on the Mount, in praise of which too strong language cannot be used, was not the setting forth of the great doctrines of the later and fuller revelation given through the Apostles so much as the clearing of the divine revelation of the Old Testament from the formalisms of "scribes Pharisees" and "hypocrites" as one will see who reads it carefully. It is significant that the "sermon" is given fully by Matthew, whose gospel is specially adapted to the Hebrew people. I allude to the Sermon on the Mount because it is understood that the gifted writer, Dr. Watson, rests his so-called "creed" upon it, as containing all the needed truths of Christianity. I have not examined his work and it is possible that he may follow it up with statements that will modify or explain his apparent attitude.

It is no reflection upon the Divine Teacher that He did not formulate all the great doctrines in His "sermon." He told the disciples afterward that he had yet "many things" to say to them which they could not yet "bear" (see John xvi. 12-15), but the "spirit of truth" would "show" them. Thus the Apostles were prepared to set forth the doctrines and shape the methods of the Christian Church.

WHAT PRESIDENT ELIOT SAYS.

President Charles W. Eliot, of Harvard University, gives his approval.

"The teaching and accepting of such a creed as that of Ian Maclaren would greatly aid the cause of Christian unity," he said. "I think it is very useful to bring it to the attention of the American public.

"It is simple, comprehensive, and not superfluous. Are there not persons not aware they have enemies, and who therefore don't have to forgive them?

"Use it in connection with historical creeds."

FALLS SHORT, SAYS PARKHURST.

"My attention has been called to this creed before," said Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst, as he read the brief articles of faith as written by Ian Maclaren, and without considering it in detail I will say it is all true, but not all the truth. It is right as far as it goes, but it falls short of reaching the perfection of a Christian creed. No one can reasonably question its validity up to the point it reaches. I am not so conservative as some, yet it does not appear to me to satisfy, by considerable, all of the requisites of a Christian creed."

DR. FAUNCE SAYS NOBLE CREED.

Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, pastor of the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, writes:—

"The creed proposed by Ian Maclaren is a noble confession of the very essence of Christianity as it was in the primitive Church. It does not embrace all the truth of the Christian faith, but it seizes the heart of it, and whoever can recite this statement has Christianity enough to live by and to die with.

"The attempt to force all existing churches into one is illusory and vain. But whoever by word or deed can make the various churches realise their fundamental unity of spirit, allegiance, and life is a benefactor of the Christian world.

"The creed of Ian Maclaren is not so much a creed as a covenant: it is a promise to live the life of Christ on

this earth. Whoever does that, whatever his opinions may be, is orthodox. No man can be saved or lost because of his opinions; but every man is saved or lost according to the Christliness of his daily life. May this new covenant find many signatures!"

DR. ABBOTT APPROVES.

Dr. Lyman Abbott, pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, gives his approval.

"Any movement," he said, "toward a simplification of creed is a movement in the right direction in the Evangelical Church, which has universally put at the entrance the result of discipleship, instead of recognising it to be a consequence, and not a condition."

INSPIRED, SAYS DR. HARROWER.

Dr. Charles S. Harrower, pastor of St. Luke's Methodist Episcopal Church, is enthusiastic over Ian MacLaren's creed.

"I believe," he said, "that Dr. Watson was divinely guided in setting forth that 'life creed' which, by the way, I would like to have called 'The Creed of the Mount.' We shall long have groups or churches centring in truths or customs which seem practical and vastly important, but beneath all diverse confessions, those metaphysical and psychological constructions of Christian truth, is a glad recognition of that simple faith in God, and Jesus, and goodness, as our Lord preached it in Judea, and that in this practical or living creed the grace of God is seen and the life of God is manifested.

"Intelligent men all over the world are rapidly coming up to this point. Let them understand it and assent to it; let them think and pray, and begin to work, and clasp hands in Christian sympathy with all who so believe. And why should there not rapidly come to be a co-operation of many elements hitherto suspicious and reserved? No restraint would be imposed on any growth or opening up of truth into doctrine in any land; only there would be less danger of giving some unnatural bias to the minds.

"I am determined to preach on the life creed, and I wish many thousands of my brethren would do the same."

WHAT MR. MILLER THINKS.

The Rev. C. Armand Miller, pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Holy Trinity, views the creed as insufficient. He writes:

"To a Lutheran the chief thing is not forms of church government or modes of worship, or of administration of sacraments, but the faith which is held and confessed, and its purity, tested by the Word of God. From his standpoint, therefore, Ian Maclaren's creed seems unsatisfactory, because of its indefiniteness and inadequacy. Surely every one who is not an atheist could subscribe to these words. But an old-fashioned evangelical believer, one who holds the ecumenical creed and the Augsburg Confession, the oldest statement of the distinctive faith of any Church, can subscribe to so much more that he would be unwilling to stop with these articles of faith.

"He would like to know—first, what does it mean, this 'fatherhood of God'? Is it based on creation alone, or does it include the adoption of sonship in the Lord Jesus Christ? The 'words of Jesus,' do they mean what they say, including a clear and definite claim of His own true, essential divinity, or are they to be emptied of their contents by rationalising methods?

"This 'clean heart,' is it to be supposed the natural possession of every man, or is it only the heart that by renewal of the Holy Ghost has been cleansed of its defilement?

"Does the acceptance of the 'words of Jesus' and the 'beatitudes' in the creed imply the rejection or subordination of the rest of the Scriptures?

"A Lutheran would make his creed by so much the shorter, as he would blend these two articles into one, reading, 'I believe in the inspired word of God, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.' And he would promise to trust in Christ, 'in whom we have redemption through His blood,' before he could finish

his creed. The two things which he could not omit in any statement of his faith are the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ and the atoning efficacy of His blood shed on Calvary. This Saviour, received by faith, is the central figure, His name the central word in that theology which still holds to the truth that shall never die."

SHREWD SCHEMES FOR PROSELYTING.

From *The Christian Advocate* (New York), January 14, 1897.

THE missions to non-Catholics held last winter by the Paulist Fathers in this city were largely advertised in the daily papers, and new plans and methods were adopted to attract "truth-seekers" and to pilot them safely over the cliffs of rising doubts.

No Catholic could be admitted to those meetings without being accompanied by a Protestant friend. Naturally every Catholic was previously invited and advised to come. Having thus the desire to go, he could say to his personal Protestant friend, "My dear friend, I would like to go to-night to the Paulist Mission, but you know I cannot be admitted without a Protestant. Will you kindly do me the favor to come with me?"

This was a shrewd scheme for gathering a non-Catholic congregation. But the zeal of the missionaries evidently could not stop there; their purpose was to inclose the visitors effectually in the fold, together with the old sheep. In order to realize it they delivered lectures, and at the end of each service a father stood at the end of the church receiving the names of those wishing to join the so-called inquiry class. Besides, there was for that class, as well as for the general public, an inquiry box opened, and the questions were not answered till another service. Among the questions answered was, "Is there any salvation outside the Catholic Church?"

This is, no doubt, a very serious question, for "salvation is the transcendental center of gravity of a man's

life, giving to the physical existence a supernatural and inestimable value." On that answer, if the question was honestly put, probably depended a decision of the highest importance, as it may have been the turning point in the life of a soul anxious to walk in the path leading to life. The inquirer had surely a sacred right to receive an unequivocal, positive answer from a teacher who pretended to instruct him about his eternal destiny. If in a commercial enterprise the whole property and the future of a business man were depending upon a banker's dealing, one would look for the banker's honesty in transacting the business, and so all would have justly expected a straightforward answer.

The following was the answer read in church : " For one who has faith and serves God as best he can, and lives according to the light of his conscience a good life, there is salvation. If that person dies, he dies in God's arms ; he dies, as it were, belonging to the soul of the Catholic Church. . . . Our Lord's idea of the Church was that of a tree. . . . If any of the branches received not the life sap, it became rotten and fell off, but as long as we were united to that tree we had life. Therefore any one who lives up to the very letter of the law, such a one will save his soul, because he belongs to the soul of the Catholic Church."

The omissions do not affect the substance of the answer, which was published on Jan. 18, 1896, in the New York "Freeman's Journal." It is, to use the mildest terms, sphinxlike, enigmatical, socratical, because it asks implicitly another question in order to answer yours. Only those who are strangers to Roman doctrines and methods will fail to discover that these lines express at the same time the orthodox Roman Catholic dogma on the way of salvation, while they seem to stretch out a tolerant hand to a more benevolent and modern view of the subject.

It is an axiom, maintained by all doctors and theologians of the Roman Church, that outside of their Church there is no salvation. "Extra Ecclesiam nulla speranda est salus."

But this doctrine appears now too cruel, and it might be unwise to proclaim it openly, especially in Protestant countries ; hence the clever scholastics found, as usual, a very poetical distinction, which is very handy to prove the pro and the contra of the question at the same time. Yes, they say, outside the holy Roman Catholic Church there is no salvation ; but you may be saved if you live a good life, for you belong to the soul of the Church.

Here is something for Protestants of which many probably never heard before. If you are good and honest Christians, you belong in spite of yourselves to the Roman Catholic Church, and only in this way you may hope to be saved. Whoever reads the anathemas of the Tridentine and Vatican Council must ask in amazement how the same Church can profess such a liberal teaching as the Paulist missionary gave to his inquirer. But in fact the apparent metamorphoses of the old doctrine is a pleasant dream. The distinction of a body and a soul of the Church is puerile and contradictory in its very terms, and rather suggests the sophistic meaning which it intends to hide. As far as the question of salvation is concerned, there is no such thing as a visible Church ; there is only the individual, standing as a spirit before a Spirit in the presence of his God. The rotten branches of a tree fall off, but the living branches, which belong, so to speak, to the soul of the tree, must be necessarily united with the body of the tree, and can in no wise belong to the soul alone.

Why was that useful metaphysical distinction not discovered to save from the tortures of a horrid death a John Huss, a Jerome of Prague, a Savonarola, and numberless victims of the holy Roman Apostolic Church, who by deeds and words professed to belong to the soul of the Church ? The reason is that in those " good old times " the Roman Church had still the power to show without any disguise the meaning of her doctrines. And even now this doctrine of salvation for all who at least belong to the soul of the Roman Church evidently is not intended for the ears of good

Catholics, because in the catechism of Catholic doctrine ("Catechism of Catholic Doctrine, No. 3," for the advanced classes of parochial schools; third edition; New York, Benziger Brothers; indorsed by Cardinal Gibbons, of Baltimore), on pages 115 and 116, we read the following questions and answers:

Who are out of the Roman Catholic Church? Out of the Church are: (1) infidels, who never received any of her sacraments; (2) heretics and schismatics, because they left the Church and belong to her only as deserters belong to an army which they have deserted; (3) excommunicated persons, because, being excluded by her sentence of excommunication from the number of her children, they belong not to her communion until they are restored by repentance. . . . 7. Can any one be saved out of the Roman Catholic Church? Out of the Roman Catholic Church no one can be saved, because Jesus Christ never gave, nor will He ever give, any other Church for the salvation of men.

These are clear and precise statements, embodying the faith to be instilled in the youthful minds of American Catholic children, unmistakably expressing that nobody can be saved outside the Roman Church.

What should we, therefore, think of the answer given by the Paulist Fathers? It seems that, after all, we may draw the conclusion that the Paulist Fathers, so broad minded that Jesuits naturally and constantly look askance at them and often oppose them, advocate the more benign interpretation of two probable doctrines, or at least seem to do so. Their answer is very good, because they ask you implicitly whether you belong to the soul of the Church; but they leave the mystery still unsolved, why they endeavor so faithfully to bring a man into the body of the Church, though he may belong already to her soul. Probably they wish to give him also the benefit of the confessional and the four other man-made sacraments, so as to die not only in the arms of God, but also in the arms of the Church. Otherwise he could not be buried in consecrated ground. If that answer is intended to be read in its mild sense, without interpolation, all Protestants have reason to rejoice, seeing that Roman Catholics begin to be ashamed of the old narrow doctrine, becoming more tolerant, admitting and recognizing at last that

other Christian people can also find their way to heaven independently of Rome, in which case the special claims of Rome are shorn of their much boasted essentiality.

CURRENT THOUGHT.

"Lowering the Pulpit."

THERE are several things that may lower the pulpit, such as a mercenary minister who cares only for the money, or social opportunity, or applause he may command, and not for the welfare of his flock; the preaching of anything that cannot be comprehended in the broad term righteousness; a ministry of doubt; discrimination against the many and in favor of the few; a minister of bad character.

Mr. Moody, of whom none of these things are true, has been accused of "lowering the pulpit," not by preaching anything but righteousness, but by dealing too plainly with some of the "sins of the age." One minister says the evangelist is irreverent, not deliberately but on account of the excitement. He tells stories that ought not to be told outside the family circle. Another says Mr. Moody is not intellectual.

Mr. Moody has not college culture, he does not preach polished, intellectual sermons, he does not belong to the school of scientific biblical critics; nevertheless he has strong intellectual powers, he knows his English Bible far better than many highly educated ministers, he has a tremendous grip on the great truths of the Gospel; and there are few preachers in this or any other country who can present and enforce these truths with equal force. Intellectual sermons do not necessarily raise the pulpit; nor do Moody's plain, un-

grammatical discourses lower it. Peter did not lower the apostolic pulpit, though he was less intellectual than Paul.

But Mr. Moody, it is complained, preaches against the sins of the age. Of course he does, and that is the right use of the Gospel. The Gospel means salvation from sins. "Thou shalt call His name Jesus; for He shall save His people from their sins." What sins? Sins of the age? Certainly. Not the sins of past ages. We have nothing to do with the sins of preceding generations; it is the sins of the age, of to-day, our sins, that we are concerned about; and we need the plain truth of the Gospel to show them to us as God sees them, abhorrent, deadly, wicked. Does it lower the medical profession to treat of terrible diseases? Does it lower the judiciary to deal with awful crimes? The preacher must preach righteousness, and he must hold up God's standard against all unrighteousness, if he would be a faithful ambassador of Christ, who brought the sins of professing believers of his day home to them.

Mr. Moody had reason to call attention to sins against the Seventh Commandment, just as Christ did. He did not do it in a vulgar or irreverent way; he did not introduce scandals. He had been told of sins of this kind in the churches, of a member who rented houses used as brothels; and he demanded, with all the earnestness of a John the Baptist

rebuking Herod, that the churches be purified.

In doing this he lowered the pulpit, some of his critics said. His reply was characteristic: "If the pulpit is as high as Bunker Hill Monument it had better come down." True; we preach to the earth, not to the stars; to men, not to the angels; to sinful beings, not to the birds, which have "no need of prayer," "no sins to be forgiven." If the pulpit is too high to reach those in sin, the quicker it is lowered the better. It does not hurt the Gospel to be brought into contact with sin; why should it hurt the pulpit?

We need a revival of practical righteousness. We want Christians of clean lives. Thieves and adulterers, cloaked with ecclesiastical respectability, are worse than the open and shameless. If there are such let them be exhorted to repent lest they perish. The good old doctrine of repentance, good when John the Forerunner came preaching it, good when Christ began His ministry with it, good in the corrupt mediæval Church, is good even in these latter days when we have a purer and better Christianity; for there is still the same temptation to lapse into wicked ways. God give the pulpit a voice to reach and rouse all workers of iniquity, whether in church pews or out of them.—*The Independent*, N. Y. (Undenomin.).

VULGAR and blasphemous evangelists are among the most serious obstacles with which pure Christianity has to contend. The man who can use the word "hell" to make a laugh, or put forward the Day of Judgment as the background of a roaring farce, who can deliver wholesale slanders worded in such a way as to imply that all earnest pastors who shrink from endorsing his grossness are in the gall of bitterness and the

bonds of iniquity, and who can traduce whole denominations because of the conduct of some of their nominal members, bears the same relation to the Christian ministry that the performances of clowns do to the serious orator. The crowds that such men draw are attracted only in part because they profess to preach the Christian religion, and chiefly by the same elements that would support a circus. It is a matter of grave doubt whether there ever was an evangelist in whose proceedings solemnity did not predominate who directly or indirectly wrought as much good as harm to Christianity.—*The Christian Advocate*, N. Y. (M. E.).

Are Unitarians Christians?

As the controversy has now arisen within the Unitarian community itself, there can be nothing unseemly or intolerant in the discussion of the question at large. Christianity has its standards of teaching, and it is impossible to broaden out these standards so as to embrace every phase of religious teaching under the sun and call it "Christian." The Moslem believes that Christ was a divine teacher, but no one would so misuse the religious terminology of the English tongue as to designate the Turkish Sultan or the Bey of Morocco as "Christian." It has been said somewhere that tolerance does not mark the progress of religion, but is rather a fatal sign of its decline; and with every desire to be liberal toward those who differ from us we think it is too great a stretch of comprehensiveness to cast the broad mantle of charity over a religious body which repudiates the fundamentals of New Testament teaching, and call it "Christian." It is calculated to mislead. It is hardly

possible, with any degree of truthfulness, to recognize a community which has no definite views regarding the nature of God and the teachings and character of Christ as truly Christian. It is simply an abuse of the term, which must lead to endless confusion. It will be more correct to speak of the Unitarians of the present day as theists or deists.—*The Living Church, Chicago* (P. E.).

ARE Unitarians Christians? This is the question raised by our Episcopal contemporary, the *Living Church*. It has decided views on the matter. It issues a journalistic ban of excommunication.

We are not so much interested in the conclusion of our contemporary as in the way that conclusion is reached. It has a perfect right to formulate its own view of Christianity, and excommunicate any one who does not accept it. That has been common enough in Christian history since the days of the apostles. That it is not so common to-day is mainly because the point of view as to what constitutes Christianity has somewhat changed. The change we refer to is not so much a change in dogma, although that has been great, but a change in respect to the value of dogma in determining Christianity and Christian fellowship.

If Christianity is to be defined on the basis of dogma, then the right of Unitarians to the Christian name will depend upon what dogmas we regard as essential to Christianity. This view has changed from age to age. If the question is to be decided by the doctrines held by Jesus himself, as reported in the Gospels, then no Christians would have a better right to call themselves Christians than those who "accept the relig-

ion of Jesus, holding, in accordance with His teaching, that practical religion is summed up in love to God and love to man"—the declaration of the last National Unitarian Conference of 1894. If the matter is to be decided by the doctrines of the Apostolic Church and the church fathers when Trinitarianism began to be developed and the deification of Jesus took place, Unitarians would have little right to the name "Christian" except as it stood for an earlier purity of faith, which later controversy displaced.

If we come down to the Calvinism of the Reformation, to the Westminster Confession, or to the Thirty-nine Articles of the English Church, and use them as the test of Christianity, it is manifest that Unitarians would have very little chance, as well as very little desire, to be included under the reproach of accepting that form of Christianity. If to be considered Christian one must believe in three Gods instead of one, in the damnation of infants and of the great majority of the race, in the implacable wrath of God visited on the damned for all eternity, in the guilt of the heathen who are living by the light of nature, in the purchase of salvation from the devil or from God Himself by the death of Jesus, then Unitarians have no right and no wish to be called Christians. Against such doctrines as these Unitarians could only set the simpler faith of the early Christians, the purer theism of Jesus, their belief in the two great commandments, the humanity of Jesus and their larger conception of the incarnation. But, when it comes to deciding who are Christians on the basis of dogma, the Church itself has never been able to come to any agreement. Catholics are doubtful about Protestants, and

Protestants about Catholics ; and Episcopalians do not recognize the ordination of ministers of Protestant denominations. In this age of the world there is no pope, council, or church of any kind with any authority to decide what Christianity is. If it is simply a question of majority, then we must all surrender to the superior numbers of the Roman Catholic Church, and the *Living Church* must give up its heresies and fall in line.

But there is another method of deciding what it is to be a Christian. Concerning this there is much more general agreement. It is to interpret Christianity, not as dogma, but as life. Then we have a wholly different set of tests. Then we pass by councils, creeds, and standards. We accept an ideal of life and character. We call it Christian, or Christ-like. It is an ideal inspired by the life of Jesus of Nazareth. It is something more than the Decalogue ; it is the glow of the beatitudes, the supremacy of the two greater commandments. The Christian life is not simply the letter of the life of Jesus : it is pre-eminently His spirit applied to the conditions of life in our own time, and with the added light and ethical growth of nineteen centuries. The test of this life will be that which Jesus gave, "Ye shall know them by their fruits ;" and the fruits we are to look for are those described by the apostle as "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance."

No unity is possible to-day in any definition of Christianity based on ritual, dogma, church polity, or tradition. There is much more unity, however, and a better unity concerning what constitutes a Christian character.

Just how Unitarians would be

classified by their evangelical brethren, when judged by such a standard, it is not for us to say. We are much more concerned that Unitarians should live up to it. It does not matter at all whether they are accused of being heretical in their opinions. That is an accusation that has been visited upon nearly every light-bringer in the world. It does matter, however, whether they may be justly accused of being selfish, hard, intolerant, dishonest, cruel, uncharitable, whether they live in hatred, variance, "envyings," "murders," "drunkenness," "revellings, and such like," of which Paul would say to-day, as he said to the Galatians, that "they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Unitarians have noble ideals and noble principles in their code of conduct ; but they must live up to them. A creed of conduct which is not lived out is no better than a creed of thought which is not believed. If Unitarians have a gospel to preach, let them preach it ; but in no way can they so well preach it as by living it.—*The Christian Register, Boston* (Unit.).

It is useless to try to induce sound, believing Christians to associate on terms of equality, and of their own free will, with those who deny the fundamentals of the faith, even though the latter are canonically still members of the Church and of the priesthood. We have a higher law to fall back upon than canons, constitutions, rubrics, or even "the Chalcedonian Decree." God's own book, which he been so blasphemed at church congresses, and the authoritative utterances of Christ's Mystical Body, are to us "organic law." We cannot, like the Phillips Brooks Club and the Bishop of Massachusetts, sit down as one

with Unitarians and complacently receive congratulations upon the fact that we are going the way the founders of Unitarianism went. We cannot agree with them to profess "our belief in God and in the sovereignty of Jesus Christ," because we know that they have an utterly different good and an utterly different Christ from the thrice Holy Deity whom the word of God reveals to men. We may be compelled by our unhappy circumstances, by the supineness of those who ought to be busy purging the Church from heresy, by the blindness of those who as yet find it impossible to believe in the existence of our half-hidden disease, to remain in outward communion with heretics and antichrists; but when it comes to voluntary gatherings in which we find ourselves beforehand to submit in patience to the utterances of falsehood upon subjects of the greatest spiritual importance, we will not do it.—*The Catholic Champion*, N. Y. (P. E.).

THE more vigorously the Unitarians deny the deity of Jesus Christ; His miraculous conception by the Holy Ghost; that His death was an essential part of God's plan to save the world; that the Holy Ghost convinces men of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment; that this life is a probation; and the more unequivocally they assert that Joseph was the father of Christ, and that Christ was but a man; that He died as a martyr; that the future life is a mixed state such as the present; and that opportunities are as good as, if not better than, those afforded here for reformation—however well balanced their periods or scholastically tentative—the more certainly and persistently will the majority of mankind turn away from their barren negations, their ice-

cold crystals of conjectural hypothesis, to account for man and his relations to God and the future life and follow those who believe and therefore speak; even as the people turned away from the Sadducees and heard Christ gladly. It is the old story. Men are saved and the Church flourishes. Formalists, sceptics, sciolists, and agnostics arise, and the Church languishes; then the truth is rediscovered and preached in the demonstration of the Spirit and with much assurance, and is invariably followed by the conversion of hundreds of thousands.—*The Christian Advocate*, N. Y. (M. E.).

The Bible.

THERE is a literary use of the Bible. If the Bible were not written, it could not be read, and if it is written at all, it must have some literary form and style. Moreover, the Scriptures do undoubtedly supply us with literature of a very elevated and interesting kind, calculated to attract notice and engage study, apart from any question as to the spiritual nature and authority of the contents of these ancient volumes. No man who uses the Bible at all fails to use it in some fashion as literature and as learning.

But what needs always to be guarded against, and especially in these days of heady rationalizing, is the literary abuse of the Bible, which, etymologically, is use "away from" the true utilization. If the Bible can be used as literature it can also be misused as literature. If the letter is essential to express the spirit the letter may also kill if the spirit be not sympathetically recognized under the external forms. The fallacy of some of the present day reasonings on this subject lies in the fact that the legitimate liter-

ary use of the Bible is confounded with the literary and spiritual abuse of the Word. It is a favorite device of an antagonist to endeavor to make it appear that the contest is on grounds of his own choosing and over issues of his own announcing, so obscuring the real advance all the while of his destructive forces into the heart of truth's exposed domain. Thus at the present time the critics of the rationalistic school are posing as the martyrs of the literary cause of the Scriptures. "You will not allow us to study the Bible as a book!" is their cry. But their posture is ridiculous rather than impressive. Nobody is telling anybody else that the Bible cannot be studied as literature. It is the literary misuse of the Scriptures which causes concern; and they do well who unmask the fight that is actually going on and discover the point where the attack is really being pressed.

What is to be said is that the Bible cannot be studied properly, even as literature, if it is regarded only as literature. It cannot be comprehended, even as the word of men, unless it be also recognized as the word of God. The spiritual instinct is necessary to interpretation. The heavenly sense alone can provide the legitimate and really understandable earthly meaning, to say nothing now of those verities of creation and redemption which the Scriptures claim exclusively to reveal.

It is when "the literary use" becomes practically the spiritual disuse that good people feel compelled to speak out in protest. And just there is where these hypercritical, opinionated mental dissections of the Scriptures come out. Under pretence of glorifying the Bible as literature such "views" exterminate its life. The Scriptures accordingly become the sepulchre and not the

source of thought. Their glory is departed, not because their meanings were read, but because they were read out of it, and a prize crew of reckless theories put on board the scriptural ship instead.

Thus it is not a mere theory as to the literary handling of the Bible, but a condition of spiritual danger that confronts us. It is not simply that there are critics of the Bible, but that there are such critics. We are not afraid to have men read the Bible, but we are afraid for the men who turn its pages with a prepossession against it, or a particular theological or philosophical case to make out by citations therefrom. No one can understand the Bible who does not put himself, or allow himself to be put by the Lord, into a Bible temper. No critical apparatus, no anatomical lectures, no probings with lancet or scalpel can hope to discover such wonders in the writings which by common consent have come to pre-empt the exclusive title of "The Bible," or "The Book," as are revealed to the eye of faith which reads there lessons written by a Father's hand at the inspiration of a spirit of holiness and love. The spiritual use of the Scriptures is always infinitely more than the literary use. It would be a pity to spend so much time in noting the markings of the shell as to miss altogether the nourishment of the kernel. What is inside is the chief thing, and no use of the Bible goes far enough that does not go to its very heart.

Criticism of a sort must be; but the proper spirit of Scripture study is indicated in the words that John Brown, when in prison, wrote in the Bible, which, just before his execution, he gave to a friend: "There is no commentary in the world so good in order

to a right understanding of this blessed Book as an honest, child-like and teachable spirit."—*The Observer*, N. Y. (Pres.).

ONE of the convincing proofs of the divine character of Christ's teachings is that they do not, like pagan systems, become obsolete. The progress of the world has not made them appear unfitted to any stage of moral and intellectual development, however advanced. Nineteen centuries have shown no moral defect in them; and though creeds which men have drawn, as the expression of those teachings, may have gradually become outworn, the teachings themselves stand more firmly than ever. The best of mankind have not yet come to the point where they can say: "We have passed beyond this doctrine of the Great Teacher; we have improved upon that doctrine; some of His sayings can no longer be reconciled with sound moral views." The defects and inconsistencies and unsoundness of the teachings of Confucius, of Buddha, of Mohammed, of Zoroaster, are so obvious that they do not need to be argued; they are self-evident to the enlightened. Their standards are far below the ideal. But it is not so with Christ's standard. We have no broader or deeper humanity than He showed to the world ages and ages ago; we have no loftier aspirations, no higher ideal, than we get from His system. In fact, we have not measured up to the stature of the full manhood which He portrayed. We have left far behind us the other great teachers of the past; but we know that we have still to learn of Him, and it does not appear that the world will ever outgrow the Divine Teacher. He will always be the one supreme Teacher, and men will always be learning of Him.—*The Independent*, N. Y. (Undenom.).

Inspiration.

THE distinction between revelation and inspiration is generally recognized, and is most valuable in order to the determining what the Bible is and how it is to be interpreted. Revelation has respect to the matter or contents of God's Word. The author of it is the Divine Word Himself, who completed in His own life the revelation of God, which had been gradually and progressively unfolding through history, institutions, and literature as embodied in the Old Testament. Inspiration, however, has only to do with the record of this revelation. Men of God wrote under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who dynamically and not mechanically influenced them in what should enter the record and the form it should take. Inspiration, therefore, leaves ample room for human individuality, for progress in the matter and form of the revelation according to the condition and attainments of the nation, for the use of much material that was not supernaturally revealed, and which was recorded as apprehended by the observer. Inspiration does nothing more than insure that the Bible will contain what God wished recorded in the furtherance of His unfolding plan of salvation, and make the record infallible for this purpose. Thus viewed, inspiration is a constant element, and, unlike revelation, is not progressive.—*The Christian Intelligencer*, N. Y. (D. Ref.).

Preaching.

THERE is a great demand in these days for practicality in the pulpit. "Give us practical sermons!" is the popular cry. This now is all right, provided always that we do not narrow the term "practical" down to the straitened limits of the particular bread-and-butter things in which we happen for the time to be inter-

ested. For the preaching at one juncture of a great doctrine of Christian truth is in its way as "practical" as a patchwork of pulpit comment upon the minutiae of every day experience is at another. To go to the root of the whole matter, there is nothing more really practical for a man than for him to consider how to be saved, and such consideration of necessity involves the thought of certain abstract truths and relations. We are unable, therefore, to approve the estimate of those who think that that is the only practical preaching which talks, not of visions of the skies, not of doctrines or creeds, but of duties and drudgeries, of marketings and merrymakings, of loaves and fishes, of habits and tempers, of speech and society. A Paul who has seen not only a Jesus, but also a truth of Jesus, which, under the guidance of the Spirit of God, he has systematized into a magnificently metaphysical theology, is as practical in his way as a James or a Jude, who are generally thought of as the apostles of right living and well-doing.—*The Observer, N. Y. (Pres.)*

THE pastor who confines his warnings to those people who are not present to hear him, waxes eloquent over the iniquity of political methods and the vagaries of Ingersoll, while he remains silent in regard to the worldly lives of his own people and their neglect of parental duties, is responsible for the inefficiency of his church, so far as one man can be responsible for others. If the pulpit is losing power as a factor in the world's life, it is because the preachers have descended from their high prophetic office to advertise themselves by means of "preludes, stereopticons, and bands." They misjudge the spirit of the age who think that

the preacher must no longer speak with authority, but must discuss theology as an open problem, defending his own hypothesis, but not claiming for it universal validity. More than ever before does the world need preachers who can speak with authority; but it must be authority based on firm conviction of divine truth, not on the assumption of superiority in natural ability or in education which a century ago gave the minister an unquestioned leadership. After all, does not the fault lie rather in a lack of courage in the pastoral relation than in want of faithful preaching? The pastor may preach once a month on the duty of Christian service and accomplish nothing, unless in his intercourse with his people, in their homes as well as at church, he urges untiringly upon them the particular form of service which he desires them to undertake.—*The Standard, Chicago (Bapt.)*

Education.

THE whole tendency of modern education is to raise in a youth the determination not to remain in the station in which it has pleased God he should be born, and it is only the exception when a man is contented to be just what his father was before him. The son of the present day intends to be a richer man, or a better-informed man, or a more independent man than his father. This is well, so long as increase of opportunity keeps pace with advance in desire; but when desire outstrips opportunity, discontent begins. The centralizing tendency of modern industry and commerce has had the effect of reducing the opportunity of the average man to achieve independence and a competency. The commercial world is every year calling for a larger army of men who are mere servants, absolutely without hope of ever being anything more than doers of nar-

row and mechanical duties, and all the while the educational world is turning out youths who are fitted for almost anything but that sort of employment. This is a state of affairs which is engaging the attention of students of social phenomena the world over. It is well worth all the eloquence the pulpit can bring to bear upon it, and all the thought that men of affairs can give to it. If the burdens of the poor are to be lightened at all, it can only be done by the exercise of practical Christianity. It will not be done by socialistic theories, nor by labor legislation, nor by any forcible overturning of the social order. The founder of Christianity never proposed any other way of reforming society than by reforming the individual. The attempt was made more than once to entrap Him into declaring in favor of some upheaval of existing institutions, but it always failed. Every precept He uttered was addressed

to the individual conscience.—*The Churchman*, N. Y. (P. E.).

It is proposed, and indeed urged, that the children of Christian families and Sabbath school scholars shall be instructed in the results of the higher criticism, and that books be prepared for the use of parents and teachers to enable them to give this instruction. We move that the proposition be laid on the table for ten years. No injury has come during the last three hundred years from receiving the Bible with simple faith, while unbelief has wrought incalculable disaster. To continue to believe the Bible for ten years longer will harm no one. In that time a great deal of the higher criticism will be overthrown, as a great deal of it has been in the past ten years. The effect of the higher criticism in Germany upon evangelical belief does not commend it to other nations professing Christianity.—*The Christian Intelligencer*, N. Y. (Ref.).

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

CONDUCTED BY REV. CHARLES R. GILLET, LIBRARIAN OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

PILGRIMS AND PURITANS.¹

SINCE the discovery, nearly forty years ago, of the birthplace and baptismal record of William Bradford, the governor-historian and one of the chief members of the Pilgrim colony at Plymouth, Mass., there has been a constant stream of books treating of the Sepa-

¹ The Pilgrim Fathers of New England and their Puritan Successors. By John Brown, D.D. With an introduction by Rev. A. E. Dunning, D.D. Third American edition. New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 1896. 8vo, pp. vii., 368, \$2.50.

Puritanism in the Old World and in the New, from its Inception in the Reign of Elizabeth to the Establishment of the Puritan Theocracy in New England. An Historical Handbook, by the Rev. J. Gregory, Edinburgh. Introduction by the Rev. Amory H. Bradford, D.D. New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 1896. 8vo, pp. x, 406.

ratists, who nourished their Congregational principles in three countries. There has been, also, a notable revival of study of the origins of Puritanism in the old world and its development in the new. Dr. John Brown, of Bedford, Eng., who has preserved with such loving care the relics of John Bunyan and given us what is, by all odds, the best life of the immortal dreamer, has also studied the English life of the men and women who formed the church at Scrooby. How they nourished their strength in Leyden and then crossed the ocean to plant the ancient and Congregational form of Christianity on American soil is told by him with animation and erudition. His comely volume is the result of a score of years' study among original State papers and documents, and examination of the places which are now almost holy to the American traveller in England and Holland. Besides telling a straightforward story, he has succeeded in unearthing not a few choice bits of new information and illustration. For example, he cites the bills for lodging and refreshment which Elder Brewster, when innkeeper at Scrooby, presented to his guest. The very important part of the Separatists' life in the Dutch republic, wherein they were powerfully educated and their minds enlarged, is but slightly noticed. Under the title "The Exiles in Holland" their whole story is compressed within sixteen pages. In fact, Dr. Brown suffers the limitations notorious in English historical writers of scarcely looking beyond England. The value of his book—and it is a very valuable book—is in his account of the every-day life of the noble exiles for conscience' sake while on English soil, in his analysis of John Robinson's writings, and in the story of how the Puritans who came to New England were transformed into State-Church Congregationalists. The narrative of New England life is carried on so as to show the development of Connecticut, the story ending with the New England confederation of 1643. While an underlying current of intense admiration pervades Dr. Brown's book, its general tone is that of the critical scholar, and the work is to be highly commended. Besides an introduction from Dr. A. E. Dunning,

of Boston, there are some very spirited illustrations by Mr. Charles Whymper, who has made his sketches in North England, Boston, Gainesboro, and Scrooby, whither annually the feet of many American pilgrims do tend.

The Rev. J. Gregory, now of Bradford, Yorkshire, the successor of Dr. William Lindsay Alexander, and lecturer in the Congregational Theological College in Edinburgh, has been a diligent student of Puritanism. Dr. Gregory takes a much broader view of history than Dr. Brown, for he looks oftener and with deeper scrutiny at those causes and movements on the Continent which influenced English life. Furthermore, he is, although living in Great Britain, not unwilling to acknowledge that the Dutch republic had much to do with the making both of British Puritanism and the English commonwealth. Holland first gave to the Anabaptists toleration and then to England most of her industries, and a very large infusion of the blood of men who were Scripture readers and thoroughly imbued with democratic principles derived both from the Bible and from long experience of life in municipal republics. However, he steers clear of the partialism of a well-known American writer who derives most of our American institutions from Holland, while he effectively replies to Mr. Oscar Straus, who would fix the odium of unjustifiable persecution on the Puritan leaders in Massachusetts. Like nearly all critical and thoroughly fair scholars, Mr. Gregory recognizes in the household of "Anabaptists," so called, the infant and cradle life of Congregationalism. In the first part of his work he speaks of Puritanism in the old world and in the second of its development in America. His book is very pleasantly arranged in chapters and paragraphs, with notes and index, in such a way as to be well worthy of its name—an historical hand-book. It may be easily studied, and will serve admirably for the use of classes. Some of his best work is found in the form of the notes, certain of which are of great value on account of their suggestiveness. He would have us probe carefully the question, "Does Calvinism promote intolerance?" In illustration of the question,

he summons several witnesses of the highest character, showing that while the Puritans cannot be wholly cleansed from the stigma of persecution, yet persecution is not necessarily inherent in Puritanism. Though the Anabaptists did not persecute, they cannot to-day show the well-ordered and free commonwealths which have been erected in Europe and America through the spirit and work of the Puritans. Dr. Gregory would also, in asking the question whether "Calvinism and Puritanism are identical," show that they are not; for Archbishop Whitgift, the bitter enemy and relentless persecutor of the Puritans, was an ardent and thorough-going Calvinist. So also was James I., the pompous intermeddler with the affairs of the Dutch republic, who called Vorstius, the successor of Arminius at Leyden, a monster and a blasphemer, and who declared that Arminius had escaped royal vengeance only by his death. As an historical hand-book this work of Dr. Gregory is not only compact, but has a judicial temper and comprehensiveness of spirit which, blended with its literary charm, must make it a valuable help to all who would study the spiritual and political ancestors of the United States—that New Europe which will surpass the old only as it is more Christian.

WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS.

Ithaca, N. Y.

BRIEF REVIEWS AND NOTES.

ONE of the most delightful books that has recently appeared is a translation from the French of Edmond Stapfer, professor in the Protestant Theological Faculty at Paris. A large part of the pleasure of the reader is due to the excellence of the translator's work. Mrs. Louise Seymour Houghton, who is so well and favorably known through her translation of Sabatier's "Francis of Assisi," has shown equal facility in the present case. It may be added that she is better qualified for her task than any mere translator, on account of the special knowledge of the subject which she pos-

sesses. The volume before us is the first in a series of three. It is called *Jesus Christ before His Ministry*, and it stops with the Temptation and a brief account of the growth of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. Our knowledge of the life of Christ during this period is confined to a few brief mentions in the Gospels; mere hints, behind which there is a richness of possibility and life. In the early ages there was the same desire to picture the details which exists to-day, and this desire found expression in the apocryphal Gospels, which were early rejected by the churches and the Christian consciousness. In these latter days we are able to picture that wonderful life after a better and truer fashion, without introducing anything of a marvellous nature. Archæology, history, philology, and investigation along a multitude of lines has made it possible to paint the background on which the Christ is projected, and to make his early life more real than ever before. Professor Stapfer is a well-versed student of geography and antiquities, and with the readiness of a Frenchman he has made a lifelike picture. Without going outside of the record for the facts of Jesus' life, he has drawn it in connection with the influences of home, state, society, education, worship, and custom, and he has succeeded in making the scenes live again. No doubt one could find all the essential facts set down in other books, but it is the beauty of this one that they are here marshalled in a complete presentation. It is a sketch from life, and it makes delightful reading. The reader will find certain things with which he will not agree—that is to be expected; but he will find many to admire, and it is possible that he will forget some of the former in the latter. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.25.)

An incidental though somewhat forgotten and neglected aspect of the service which the Bible has rendered to mankind is found in its relation to literature. It is well known that the German Bible of Luther had a formative influence upon the tongue of the Fatherland. The same thing, to a degree too little appre-

ciated, is true of the English Bible in its various versions. For vigorous and idiomatic English it is difficult to find an equal to the version of King James; but a style built upon it, or one in which it finds an echo, is rare—as rare as it is forceful. The fact is, as Professor Moulton says, in his paper in a recent volume called *The Bible as Literature*, that the Bible is a “literature smothered by reverence.” In a sense this is quite true, just as it is true that it has been put to superstitious uses in ill accord with its true purpose and nature. It was to aid in the understanding of the Bible in its aspect as an important element in the literature of the world, that the book mentioned above was prepared. It is a series of papers or essays dealing with the literary aspects of the various Books, and forming a sort of biblical introduction. The names of the writers, were it possible to name all of the twenty-one who have contributed to these pages, would be a sufficient guarantee of the worth and importance of the volume. Professor Richard G. Moulton, of Chicago University, the apostle of the subject, leads, and he is ably seconded by others whose names are more or less intimately associated with the books of which they treat. While it is not exhaustive, and while as a whole it has a sketchy and partial character, yet the book is one that may well serve as an introduction to larger and fuller treatments of the whole subject. It gains in value and importance, also, on account of the consensus of opinion presented by so many writers. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. \$1.50.)

A Compendium of Church History is not an easy book to write. It is necessary that the author should exercise the utmost self-control lest he spoil the proportion of the whole by dwelling at too great length upon some topics in which he feels particular interest. The task has been performed by Dr. Andrew C. Zenos, Professor of Biblical Theology in the McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, in a very commendable manner. He has observed due proportion, and he has presented the main facts in a clear and excellent way. He has

divided the nineteen Christian centuries into three periods, the years 590 and 1517 being the points of separation. To each he has assigned about one hundred duodecimo pages, an excess of thirty pages in the third division being devoted to the history of the churches in the United States. In the introduction, written by Dr. John De Witt, of Princeton, it is remarked that the book is the best of its sort. The remark is true. For a general view of the whole field in brief space it is not possible to find a better book. The little volume of Sohm, recently translated, is also brief, but it is occupied more with a philosophical presentation than with a rehearsal of facts. Together these books make an admirable addition to the handbook literature in English upon this interesting and instructive subject. (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. \$1.00.)

We take pleasure in calling attention to a valuable and conscientious piece of historical work embodied in a volume called *Europe in the Middle Age*, by Oliver J. Thatcher, Ph.D., and Ferdinand Schwill, Ph.D., professors in Chicago University. The book contains nearly seven hundred pages, post-octavo in size, is well arranged, and clearly written. It is illustrated with historical maps, and gives the reader a very clear idea of the subject in hand. While it is primarily intended for the use of college students, it is a valuable book for ordinary historical reading. The authors have not been unmindful of the fact that in order to comprehend mediæval history it is necessary to know something about the history of Roman Christianity, the institutions of the Church and the drift of religious and theological thought. The very first list of books cited shows this. As collateral reading with the ordinary work on church history this volume will prove its usefulness and value. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.00 net.)

Many preachers think that doctrinal preaching would empty the pews. There is no doubt that some sorts would do so, but the fault would lie more in the man-

ner than in the matter. Such is the testimony of the Rev. Alfred G. Mortimer, D.D., rector of St. Mark's, in Philadelphia. As a help to a consistent and systematic exposition of the themes comprised under the head of dogmatic theology he has prepared a volume on *Catholic Faith and Practice*, which he designates as "a manual of theological instruction for confirmation and first communion." It is a systematic treatment of the chief heads of divinity from the "Catholic" point of view. The general attitude of the author may be judged in part from his dedication to Dr. Percival, and for the rest by his use of terms and the inclusiveness of his topics. Many of the terms and things treated will be sought in vain in most Protestant systems of theology, and with his churchly attitude a goodly number in his own communion will disagree. But one admirable quality he possesses: he makes his meaning thoroughly clear, and the reader may be left to agree or not as he will. It is a pity that more of our books on theology were not equal to this in this respect. The author promises a second volume if the present book shall receive sufficient commendation and support. He has adopted the somewhat unusual method of giving a prospectus of the second volume, thus enabling the reader to know what he is to get if he approves of the present sample. The value of the book is double: it is intended to aid the younger members of the clergy to an understanding of the teachings of the Church on the topics discussed, and it will enable those who do not fall in this category to learn what some members of the Episcopal Church think that their Articles inculcate. It is thus a very easy matter for the purchaser to know whether he wants the book or not. (New York: Longmans, Green & Co.)

There is no doubt that the Rev. John Robertson, minister of the Gorbals Tabernacle, in Glasgow, is a vigorous preacher. A recent volume of sermons, which he calls *Corn on the Mountains*, gives full evidence of the fact. There are fourteen discourses in the volume, and they are all instinct with life. They

read like extempore addresses, but they give evidence of thought, and they are all examples of a wonderful facility in the use of phrases and of adjectives. At times they are denunciatory enough to have satisfied John Knox himself, but at times they would shock some of the followers of the reformer. Some would call them sensational, and probably they are open to the charge, but it is a sensationalism different from the article which we usually call by that name. There is a true ring about the sentiment, though the language at times would shock gentle ears. (New York : Revell Co. §1.25.)

A new disciple of Origen has arisen in the end of the nineteenth century in the person of Rev. W. J. Harsha, D.D., pastor of the Second Collegiate Reformed Church, of Harlem, New York City. Taking the record of the journeyings of the Israelites from Egypt toward the Promised Land, as given in Numbers xxxiii., he makes the desert names blossom with the flowers of allegory. He calls the whole *Sabbath-Day Journeys*, and at the rate of one each week the reader will be able to gather the whole nosegay in a year. It is a way of reading into Scripture lessons that were not intended, unless the author wishes to go to the lengths of the critics and see in the names an imaginary itinerary, constructed on an artificial and fictitious basis. But he should have proceeded with more caution. The most glaring and most prominent instance of lack of thoroughness is found in the first "journey" to "Rameses." Of Rameses he says that "It was a fertile district, lying at the foot of the beautiful hills, almost opposite the pyramids on the other side of the Nile. Up in the mountains behind the foothills, was the village of On. . . . Other villages of this district were Aven, or Heliopolis, and Bethshemesh, of which we read frequently in the Scriptures." In point of fact, as the author might have learned if he had taken the pains, all four of these names belonged to one and the same place ! On the next page he gives an etymology of the name Rameses well suited to take the breath

of an Egyptologist, when he says that it means "the melting or washing away of evil." He thus makes doubtful Hebrew of excellent Egyptian, and misleads his reader. In the subsequent chapters he missed glorious opportunities when he passed over Etham without looking into its meaning, and when he passed by Migdol which lay hard by his track. We have no sympathy with the author's method of extracting lessons from passages which do not contain them, but are free to say that he has gathered together many excellent observations upon many subjects, and we have no doubt that there are cases where the book may do good in spite of its methods and faults. (New York: Revell Co. \$1.00.)

A book of somewhat similar character, but one to which the same objection does not apply, and one which illustrates more correctly the meaning of the words "Now these things were our examples," is Dr. Alexander Whyte's *Bible Characters: Adam to Achan*. The author's "Bunyan Characters" is already well known, and in the present volume he has taken up no less than twenty-six biblical personages and drawn useful lessons from their lives. There is a vast difference between lessons drawn from the deeds and words of living men, behind which there were springs and principles of action, and lessons drawn from a catalogue of desert names. The New Testament word applies to the one, but its application to the other is far fetched. In this volume Dr. Whyte shows penetration and appreciation, and in spite of a picturesque style and method he has succeeded in placing before the reader considerations which are applicable to modern life with its multitude of details. It is not a book to be copied servilely, but it may serve as a suggestion of a profitable method of treating the general theme. (New York, etc.: Revell Co. \$1.25.)

It is a compliment to a book to lay it down with regret. This is the feeling which we have experienced with one called *Chapters from a Life*. It is an autobiographical sketch by the author of that book read

with such interest in childhood days, "Gates Ajar," Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, now Mrs. Herbert D. Ward. It is one of those sketchy books which hold the attention by the unforced way in which topics are suggested and treated, as well as by the fascination exerted by the natural history, so to speak, of the books which have claimed the attention of many readers. The foreground of the picture, of course, is old Andover Hill, and the delineation will be appreciated most by those who are acquainted with the beauties of the spot. The associations formed there live on in spite of years. But the story of the Gloucester life has in it more of the every-day, human element: it comes nearer to the human heart. It is a matter of congratulation that the author shook off her dislike for writing of this sort, and has given us a glimpse of her literary career, and of her inmost thoughts. It might be possible to find fault with details, though the fault finding of the critic would not trouble one who never reads reviews of her books, but it would be an ungracious task as well as a destructive thing to tear to pieces a rose whose beauty lies in the irregularity as well as in the perfume of its petals. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$1.50.)

The Rev. Frank S. Child has made another excursion into the field of New England history, and this time has taken up one of the chief distinguishing features of colonial life—namely, *The Colonial Parson of New England*. It is not necessary to say that the subject is interesting, and that it would bear a larger volume than Mr. Child has seen fit to make. He has given many little stories which are of interest, but he might have added more. In fact, one of the pleasures of the book lies in the stories which it suggests. The work illustrates the versatility of the minister of the early period, and his exploits in various fields are here set forth. Agriculture, politics, literature, scholarship, all claimed a portion of his aggregate attention. He was also a preacher, and a man, and these relations and functions come in for notice. Quaint lore and out-of-the-way information have been gathered to grace the page

and to chain the attention, and the chief complaint that one might make, were one of a carping disposition, would be that the book is no larger and fuller than it is. In some respects, however, this is a compliment, and as such it is intended. (New York: Baker & Taylor Co. \$1.25.)

The man who is so blinded to facts as to assert that the "Higher Criticism" has "accomplished nothing" is scarcely a safe guide in matters related to the Bible. This is the assertion of the Rev. William B. Bolmer in a recent volume called *The Church and the Bible*. There is evidence from plenty of men who have knowledge of the facts, men who are not themselves critics and who are not open to the charge of partiality to their own pursuits, that for them and for those with whom they have been in contact, the literary criticism of the Holy Scriptures has resulted in a truer and deeper perception of the truth than they had previously had. It has made the Bible a new and living book to many. Wholesale denunciation of all critics is simply ignorant. For a man to say that a mistake in quoting the Old Testament, if made by Christ, would shake his faith in all of Christ's sayings, is to put the emphasis where it does not belong, and to base his faith on a dangerous foundation. The line of argument followed in this book we regard as more of a menace to Christianity than the work of any critic: the book itself is full of a spirit which is so narrow as to make its author appear ignorant. (New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co.)

The Rev. J. H. Brookes, D.D., of St. Louis, treats of an important subject in his volume on *The Resurrection of Christ*. For the significance of the event we have the testimony of the great apostle. The present volume is, however, mainly apologetic in its treatment, and occupies itself with the evidences from ancient writers and from the Biblical accounts. This may be exceedingly valuable in its way, but we have the impression that a new book on the subject was scarcely needed. Something that would have met a more real want and need would have been a treatment of the

things involved in Christ's resurrection ; its significance for the Christian life and its relation to the wellbeing of Christians to-day. The world seems awakening to a new sense of the meaning and the implications of the Incarnation ; why not also to the importance of the Resurrection ? The difficulty in the present case would be in the author's views as to the millennium, which many regard as little short of heresy. (Philadelphia : Presbyterian Board of Publication.)

An important and timely contribution to the discussion of the relations of the "unspeakable Turk" to the nations of Christendom, and particularly to our own country, is found in an address delivered before the American Board at Toledo last October. It deals with "The duty of the United States of America to American citizens in Turkey." It is a forcible presentation of the subject from the standpoint of a leader of the New York bar, and it is couched in no equivocal terms. It sets at rest the objections of some to any interference in the outrages that have been perpetrated and which are yet feared. The stories that we have heard are blood curdling, and if our government has any influence or power to put a stop to these deeds of wanton violence, that influence and power should be exercised. (New York : Revell Co.)

The latest addition to the "By-Paths of Bible Knowledge" which we have received is a monograph on *The Arch of Titus*, by the late Rev. William Knight. It contains a very interesting and detailed account of the destruction of Jerusalem, the triumph of Titus, and the Jewish sacred vessels, as well as of the arch. The whole makes one of those valuable little books, handy for reference and entertaining for perusal. It draws a most graphic picture of the horrors of the time, and gives the background of the history of the apostolic age. (New York : Revell Co. \$1.00.)

In the "Booklet" series of Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. we have three small pieces, each being a pretty little volume, tastefully bound and decorated. They are "A Gentle Heart," by Dr. J. R. Miller ; "Culture

and Reform," by Anna Robertson Brown, Ph.D. ; and "The Happy Life," by Dr. Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard University. (35 cents.)

"The Presbyterian Christian Endeavor Manual," prepared by Dr. J. R. Miller and William T. Ellis, is a neat little volume (32mo) containing much valuable matter and many practical hints. (Philadelphia : Presbyterian Board of Publication.)

SUBJECT INDEX TO THEOLOGICAL PERIODICALS.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS RECORD.

Af. M. E. R.	African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)	Meth. R.	Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)
Am. Cath. Q. R.	American Catholic Quarterly Review.	Meth. R. So.	Methodist Review, South. (Quarterly.)
Am. J. T.	American Journal of Theology.	Miss. H.	Missionary Herald.
Bib. Sac.	Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)	Miss. R.	Missionary Review.
Bib. W.	Biblical World.	New Chr. Q.	New Christian Quarterly.
Can. M. R.	Canadian Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)	New W.	The New World. (Quarterly.)
Chr. L.	Christian Literature.	Pre. M.	Preacher's Magazine.
Church Q. R.	Church Quarterly Review.	Presb. Q.	Presbyterian Quarterly.
Ex.	Expositor.	Presb. Ref. R.	Presbyterian and Reformed Review. (Quarterly.)
Ex. T.	Expository Times.	Prot. Ep. R.	Protestant Episcop. Review.
Hom. R.	Homiletic Review.	Ref. C. R.	Reformed Church Review. (Quarterly.)
Luth. C. R.	Lutheran Church Review.	Treas.	The Treasury.
Luth. Q.	Lutheran Quarterly.	Yale R.	The Yale Review. (Quarterly.)

Unless otherwise specified, all references are to the January number of periodicals.

Agnosticism, Theological. (A. B. Bruce) Am. J. T.
American Christianity. (L. W. Bacon) Chr. L.
Anglo-Saxon race, Future of the. (G. S. Payson) Treas.
Animals, lower, Sympathy with the. (M. M. Curtis) Bib. Sac.
Ante-Nicene Fathers. (R. W. Micou) Chr. L.
Apostolic and modern missions. (C. Martin) Presb. Ref. R.
Apostolic Church, Fellowship of goods in the. (S. H. Cobb) Presb. Ref. R.
Army of the Cross. (W. P. Hall) Hom. R.
Aryans, Literature and worship of the early. (D. Moore) Presb. Q.
Augustine and the Pelagian controversy. (B. B. Warfield) Chr. L.
Awtort, Note on the meaning of the word. (J. H. Wilkinson) Ex.
Bible, Importance of presenting the, in complete books from the pulpit. (F. W. Farrar) Hom. R.
Body as a machine. (R. H. Thurston) Luth. C. R.
Brain as the basis of mind. (W. H. Harrison) Luth. C. R.
Building from the base. (A. T. Pierson) Miss. R.
Chalmers, Thomas. (J. S. Gilbert) Treas.

- Childhood**, Ideal, in non-Christian religions. (G. S. Goodspeed) Bib.W.
- Christ**, Ever-living. (C. S. Gerhard) Ref.C.R.
- Christian doctrine**, Principle of. (E. V. Gerhart) Ref.C.R.
- Christmas**, Ananias of Shirak upon. (F. C. Conybeare) Chr.L.
- Christ's attitude to His own death**. (A. M. Fairbairn) Ex.
- Civilization**, Dogmatic theology and. (W. Alexander) Presb.Ref.R.
- Congregationalism** in foreign missions. (A. N. Hitchcock) Miss H.
- Deeper things**, Some of the. (F. B. Meyer) Miss.R.
- Doctrine**, Development of, in the pre-Christian church. (G. J. Low) Chr.L.
- Ecuador**, Entrance of. (G. S. Fisher) Miss.R.
- Education**, ministerial, Presbyteries and the standard of. (T. C. Johnson) Presb.Q.
- Eighteenth century club**. (R. T. Stevenson) Bib.Sac.
- Elder** in his ecclesiastical relations. (R. E. Prime) Presb.Q.
- Election**, Divine, Historic purpose of the: the doctrine viewed from the standpoint of Isaiah. (W. C. Schaeffer) Ref.C.R.
- Episcopate**, Historic, in its relation to church unity. (T. Duncan) Prot.Ep.R.
- Evolution**, Ethics of. (M. M. Kinard) Luth.C.R.
- Evolution** and the fall of man. (D. W. Simon) Bib.Sac.
- Exodus** from Egypt, Historical relation of the Book of Genesis to the. (J. W. Dawson) Hom.R.
- Faith** and knowledge. (W. E. Barton) Treas.
- Field**, Frederick. (J. H. Burn) Ex.T.
- General Assembly**, Powers of the. (R. M. Patterson) Presb.Ref.R.
- Genesis**, Archaeological commentary on. (A. H. Sayce) Ex.T.
- Genesis**, Book of, Historical relation of the, to the exodus from Egypt. (J. W. Dawson) Hom.R.
- Gideon**, Story of. (M. G. Pearse) Pre.M.
- God's presence**, Angel of. (W. I. Haven) Treas.
- Harnack's** "History of Dogma." (A. T. Swing) Bib.Sac.
- Hinduism**, Reformed. (J. W. Brooks) Hom.R.
- Holy Spirit**, Historical mission of the. (A. G. Voight) Luth.C.R.
- Hort**, F. J. A., Life and Letters of. (W. Sanday) Am.J.T.
- Human body**, What the Bible teaches about the. (D. Brown) Chr.L.
- Indian famine**. (J. Smith) Miss.H.
- Indians**. Gospel among the red men. (E. R. Young) Miss.R.
- Inheritance**, Material basis of, and the problem of evil. (R. C. Scheidt) Ref.C.R.
- Institutional church**, Symposium on the. Hom.R.
- Isaiah**, Fifty third chapter of. Bib.W.
- Life**, Way of. (G. F. Bushnell) Treas.
- Luther** and religious persecution. (D. Moore) Presb.Ref.R.
- Lutheran Church**, German, Genesis of the, in the land of Penn. (J. F. Sachse) Luth.C.R.
- Lyceum**, American. (H. D. Jenkins) Presb.Ref.R.
- Machiavelli**, Influence of, on the Reformation in England. (W. A. Phillips) Chr.L.
- Madagascar**, Trying times in. (W. E. Cousins) Miss.R.
- "Master-passion."** (W. I. Fletcher) Bib.Sac.
- Matthew xxiv.** and Professor Milligan's exegesis. (L. Link) Presb.Q.

- Mecca** certificate. (W. H. Jessups) Miss.R.
Melanchthon, Philip. Luth.C.R.
Melanchthon, Philip. (E. D. Warfield) Presb.Ref.R.
"Mind of the Master." (G. A. Chadwick) Ex.
Missions, Apostolic and modern. (C. Martin) Presb.Ref.R.
Missions, What the Bible says about. Miss.H.
Morals, Basis of. (G. G. Findlay) Ex.T.
New Testament, Bernhard Weiss and the. (C. R. Gregory) Am.J.T.
Old Testament, Linguistic history of the, and Maurice Vernes' dating of the documents. (E. Konig) Ex.
"Oxford movement" for the promotion of holiness. Miss.R.
Parables, Interpretation of the. (G. H. Hubbard) Treas.
Pelagian controversy, Augustine and the. (B. B. Warfield) Chr.L.
Perfection, Christian. (J. A. Beet) Ex.
Poor, Homes of the. (W. H. P. Faunce) Treas.
Pope and the Anglicans. (T. A. Lacey and Catholicus) Chr.L.
Predictive element in Old Testament prophecy. (W. R. Betteridge) Bib.Sac.
"Priest of Penitence." (E. N. Bennett) Ex.
Prophecy, Old Testament, Predictive element in. (W. R. Betteridge) Bib.Sac.
Prophets, Notes on obscure passages of the. (T. K. Cheyne) Ex.
Prosperity, national, Conditions of. (J. S. Stahr) Ref.C.R.
Protestantism, modern, Professor Harnack on. Chr.L.
Reformation, Scottish. (D. Tucker) Prot.Ep.R.
Reformation in England, Influence of Machiavelli on the. (W. A. Phillips) Chr.L.
Reformed Church Review: its purpose. Ref.C.R.
Regeneration real, not figurative. (J. W. Primrose) Presb.Q.
Religious life: its nature and claims. (J. H. Fairchild) Bib.Sac.
Religious outlook in England. (A. M. Fairbairn) Chr.L.
Religious thought, Limits of. (H. Carmichael) Prot.Ep.R.
Reviews, old, Among the. (H. R. Kremer) Ref.C.R.
Revised Version, Doctrinal significance of the. (G. Milligan) Ex.T.
Revival, Coming: its characteristics. (C. H. Payne) Hom.R.
Sabbath, Civil. (W. L. Nourse) Presb.Q.
Sacred books, Natural history of. (A. Menzies) Am.J.T.
Schürer's, Dr., reply. (W. M. Ramsay) Ex.
Seminary, Beginnings of the. (G. K. Krotel) Luth.C.R.
Seminary life, Aims and conditions of. (W. T. Hall) Presb.Q.
Service, Social law of. (N. D. Hillis) Bib.Sac.
Son of Man seeking the lost. (D. W. Moody) Treas.
Soul, Ship of the. (S. A. Brooke) Pre M.
Strength, From, to strength. (J. Stalker) Pre M.
Supernaturalism, Christian. (B. B. Warfield) Presb.Ref.R.
Sweden, Church of, and its episcopate. (N. Forsander) Luth.C.R.
Symbolism, Christian, in Puritan churches. (W. E. Griffis) Chr.L.
"The great change." (C. Walker) Prot.Ep.R.
Theological thought, Recent tendencies in. (A. H. Strong) Am.J.T.
Theological training for the times. (G. B. Foster) Bib.W.
Theology, Dogmatic, and civilization. (W. Alexander) Presb.Ref.R.
Theology, New. (J. A. Biddle) Bib.Sac.
Theology, Reconstruction of. (D. N. Beach) Bib.Sac.

Theology, Scope of, and its place in the university. (C. A. Briggs) Am. J. T.

Vrooman case. (R. C. Reed) Presb. Q.

Weiss, Bernhard, and the New Testament. (C. R. Gregory) Am. J. T.

Zacharias: a study of Matt. 23 : 35. (J. Macpherson) Bib. W.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

American Journal of Theology.

Chicago, January, 1897.

Theological agnosticism.

Bernhard Weiss and the New Testament.

Scope of theology and its place in the university.

Natural history of sacred books.

Life and letters of F. J. A. Hort.

Recent tendencies in theological thought.

Biblical World.

Chicago, January, 1897.

Ideal childhood in non-Christian religions.

Theological training for the times.

Zacharias: a study of Matt. 23 : 35.

The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.

Bibliotheca Saera.

Oberlin, January, 1897.

Evolution and the fall of man.

Religious life: its nature and claims.

Sympathy with the lower animals.

Predictive element in Old Testament prophecy.

An eighteenth century club.

"Master-passion."

New theology.

Reconstruction of theology.

Social law of service.

Harnack's "History of Dogma."

Christian Literature.

New York, January, 1897.

Development of doctrine in the pre-Christian church.

Augustine and the Pelagian controversy.

Influence of Machiavelli on the Reformation in England.

Ananias of Shirak upon Christmas.

Pope and the Anglicans.

Religious outlook in England.

Christian symbolism in Puritan churches.

Professor Harnack on modern Protestantism.

What the Bible teaches about the human body.

"Ante-Nicene fathers."

American Christianity.

The Expositor.

London, January, 1897.

"Mind of the Master."

Christ's attitude to His own death. Christian perfection.

Notes on obscure passages of the prophets.

St. John's view of the Sabbath rest.

Linguistic history of the Old Testament, and Maurice Vernes' dating of the documents.

On Dr. Schürer's reply.

"Priest of Penitence."

Note on the meaning of the word *ἀγιος*.

Expository Times.

Edinburgh, January, 1897.

Basis of morals.

Frederick Field.

Doctrinal significance of the Revised Version.

Archæological commentary on
Genesis.

The Homiletic Review.

New York, January, 1897.

Importance of presenting the Bible in complete books from the pulpit.

Historical relation of the Book of Genesis to the Exodus from Egypt.

Coming revival—its characteristics.

Reformed Hinduism.

Symposium on the institutional church.

Army of the Cross.

The Lutheran Church Review.

Philadelphia, January, 1897.

Beginnings of the seminary.

Historical mission of the Holy Spirit.

Ethics of evolution.

Brain as the basis of mind.

Body as a machine.

Genesis of the German Lutheran

Church in the land of Penn.

Church of Sweden and its episcopate.

Philip Melancthon.

The Missionary Herald.

Boston, January, 1897.

What the Bible says about missions.

Congregationalism in foreign missions.

Indian famine.

Missionary Review.

New York, January, 1897.

Building from the base.

Genesis of the "Oxford Movement" for the promotion of holiness.

Some of the deeper things.

Gospel among the red men.

Trying times in Madagascar.

Mecca certificate.

Entrance of Ecuador.
Three years' enterprise.

Preacher's Magazine.

New York, January, 1897.

From strength to strength.

Ship of the soul.

Story of Gideon.

Homiletics.

The Presbyterian Quarterly.

Richmond, January, 1897.

Regeneration real, not figurative.

Matt. xxiv. and Professor Milligan's exegesis.

Civil Sabbath.

Literature and worship of the early Aryans.

Presbyteries and the standard of ministerial education.

Aims and conditions of seminary life.

Elder in his ecclesiastical relations.

Vrooman case.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review.

Philadelphia, January, 1897.

Philip Melancthon.

Fellowship of goods in the Apostolic Church.

Dogmatic theology and civilization.

American Lyceum.

Christian supernaturalism.

Apostolic and modern missions.

Luther and religious persecution.

Powers of the General Assembly.

Protestant Episcopal Review.

Theological Seminary, Va., January, 1897.

Limits of religious thought.

Historic episcopate in its relation to church unity.

Scottish reformation.

The great change.

Reformed Church Review.

Lancaster, January, 1897.

Reformed Church Review: its purpose.
Principle of Christian doctrine.
Historic purpose of the Divine election.
Conditions of national prosperity.
Ever-living Christ.
Among the old reviews.
Material basis of inheritance and the problem of evil.

The Treasury.

New York, January, 1897.

Way of life.
Angel of God's presence.
Faith and knowledge.
Son of Man seeking the lost.
Homes of the poor.
Interpretation of the parables.
Future of the Anglo-Saxon race.
Thomas Chalmers.

MAGAZINES.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for February contains: "Democratic Tendencies," E. L. Godkin; "Thirty Years of the Peabody Education Fund," D. C. Gilman; "The Story of an Untold Love," VIII.-X., Paul Leicester Ford; "A Study of American Liquor Laws," Charles W. Eliot; "The Juggler," V., Charles Egbert Craddock; "My Sixty Days in Greece," I., Basil L. Gildersleeve; "Village Improvement Societies," Mary Caroline Robbins; "Emerson, Sixty Years After," II., John Jay Chapman; "Cheerful Yesterdays," IV., Thomas Wentworth Higginson; "Puvis De Chavannes in Boston," Cecilia Waern; "Love's Delay," Elia W. Peattie; "Two Interpreters of National Architecture," Henry Van Brunt.

CONTENTS of the CENTURY for February are: "Campaigning with Grant," Horace Porter; "Places in New York," Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer; "The Body to the Soul," John Vance Cheney; "Monotypes," William A. Coffin; "The Battle of Copenhagen," Alfred T. Mahan; "An Inland Venice," Charles de Kay; "In the Desert with the Bedouin," R. Talbot Kelly; "Hugh Wynne, Free Quaker," S. Weir Mitchell; "The Author of 'Rory O'More,'" Fanny Schmid; "Miss Selina's Settlement," Mrs. Burton Harrison; "A Tropic Climb," Julian Hawthorne; "A Man and Some Others," Stephen Crane; "A Rose of Yesterday," F. Marion Crawford; "Billy and Hans," W. J. Stillman; "Why the Confederacy Failed." Opinions of General Officers.

FEBRUARY HARPER'S contains: "The Coronation," Richard Harding Davis; "Lincoln's Home Life in Washington," Leslie J. Perry; "A Passage at Arms," John J. A'Becket; "The Awakening of a Nation," Charles F. Lummis; "Hygeia in Manhattan," Richard Wheatley; "Architecture and Modern Life," Thomas Hastings; "The Stout Miss Hopkins's Bicycle," Octave Thanet; "The Martian," George Du Maurier; "The Assembly Ball," Sara Beaumont Kennedy; "White Man's Africa. The President of the Orange Free State," Poultney Bigelow; "Composers and 'Artistes,'" Rev. H. R. Haweis; "Princess I-Would-I-Wot-Not," Margaret Sutton Briscoe.

THE contents of LIPPINCOTT'S MAGAZINE for February are: "Under the Pacific," Clarence Herbert New; "South Florida since the Freeze," R. G. Robin-

son; "The Dignity and Humor of Signs," Agnes Carr Sage; "Old Tom of Nantucket," Joseph A. Altsheler; "Irrigation," Albert G. Evans; "A Vanished Civilization," Henry Granville; "Marrying in the Fifteenth Century," H., Emily Bailly Stone; "A Forestry Idyl," M. S. Paden; "The Southern Side of the Industrial Question," Frances Albert Doughty; "Gloves," Elizabeth Ferguson Seat; "Old Friends," Edith Brower; "Overdoing the Past," Charles C. Abbott.

IN McCLURE'S MAGAZINE for February Mr. H. J. W. Dam has a particularly interesting article on "The Making of the Bible." First it describes by what strange, and almost miraculous, means narratives of which the original records have utterly perished, survived in fair integrity through centuries of turmoil and confusion; and next it describes the finely wrought, typically modern, instrumentalities and appliances by which those narratives are today published to the world, in all its varied languages, by the million copies, through the Oxford University Press. Pictures of the University Press and facsimiles of early texts illustrate the article.

FEBRUARY SCRIBNER'S contains: "A Great Hotel," Jesse Lynch Williams; "Soldiers of Fortune," Richard Harding Davis; "Forget," Richard Hodgson; "A Woman," William Henry Shelton; "London," As Seen by C. D. Gibson; "Pial Azôn," C. Grant La Farge; "The Messenger," Robert W. Chambers; "Giuseppe Segantini," Alfredo Melani; "The City Magistrates' Courts," Robert C. Cornell; "The Last Plantagenet," Henry Cabot Lodge; "The Miniature Portrait," Evangeline W. Blashfield.

LITERARY NOTES.

THE Clarendon Press will publish shortly the Hebrew original of ten chapters of Ecclesiasticus (xxxix. 15-xlix. 11) lately discovered in the East. It was generally supposed that St. Jerome was the last scholar who saw or possessed it, until recently a Hebrew treatise, written by Saadiah Gaon (about 920 A.D.), was found, in which the author quotes several sentences in Hebrew from Ecclesiasticus. Thus the book was still extant at that time in Bagdad, where Saadiah lived. No further trace of the Hebrew text was discovered until about June, 1896, when a manuscript leaf brought to England by Mrs. Lewis, of Cambridge, was recognized as a portion of the long-lost original of Ecclesiasticus. The credit of this discovery belongs to Mr. S. Schechter, Reader in Talmudic in the University of Cambridge. Almost simultaneously, nine leaves of the same manuscript, brought likewise from the East, were identified in the Bodleian library. The Cambridge leaf was published by Mr. Schechter, with an English translation and short commentary in the *Expositor* for July, 1896.

THE Clarendon Press is now issuing a critical edition of all ten leaves, consisting of the Hebrew original, accompanied by an English translation and the Greek, Syriac, and Old Latin versions, followed by a complete glossary of new forms found in the Hebrew text, and of words used in new senses. A full list is added of the proverbs of Jesus, son of Sirach, genuine and spurious, found in Talmudic and Rabbinic literature, arranged according to the order of the Greek version. The preface gives full literary particulars respecting the book. One main

result of the new text is that it proves Sirach to have written classical Hebrew (with the exception of a few New-Hebrew words). Two facsimile pages, the first and last of the Oxford fragment, are appended, showing marginal notes of various readings, somewhat resembling the Massora to the Old Testament.

THE British Museum has acquired a papyrus recently discovered in Egypt, and believed to date from the first century before Christ, containing a substantial portion of the lost odes of Bacchylides, whom some of the ancient critics classed with his contemporary Pindar. So far as the writing is concerned (says the *Times*), the manuscript is in very good condition, being handsomely written in rather large uncial characters on papyrus of fine quality; but unfortunately it has suffered severely at the hands of its native discoverers, and is torn into many fragments. It will, of course, be the work of time to bring the fragments into their proper order, and it is too early as yet to say how many poems are contained in the new manu-

script; but there would seem to be parts, at least, of some fifteen or twenty, varying in length from fourteen to about two hundred lines. Hitherto Bacchylides has been known only through quotations, of which the longest is a fragment of twelve lines in praise of peace.

A BOOK of "Samaritan Liturgies," edited by Mr. A. E. Cowley, of the Bodleian Library, is now being prepared at the Clarendon Press.

AMONG the books announced for early publication by Messrs. Longmans & Co., besides some works on vexed subjects by men like Dean Luckock and Dr. Wigram, of South Africa, and Wilfrid Ward's *Life of Wiseman*, are "The Bible: its Meaning and Supremacy," by Dean Farrar, two by the late Canon Liddon, "Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy," and "Sermons Preached on Special Occasions, 1858-89," the late Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson's "Memories and Ideals," and a volume of "Essays," by the late George John Romanes.

CHRONICLE, OBITUARY, AND CALENDAR.

COMPILED BY PROFESSOR GEORGE W. GILMORE, A.M.

CHRONICLE.

(Closes on the 10th.)

Nov. 25-27.—Meeting of the *North Wales Calvinistic Methodist Association*, at Wrexham.

Dec. 2.—Annual Meeting of the *Methodist Episcopal Church's Board of Education*, in New York City.

Dec. 6.—Twenty third Anniversary of the *Organization of the Reformed Episcopal Church*.

Dec. 8-10.—First Annual Convention of the *American Anti-Saloon League*, in Washington, D. C.

Dec. 10-14.—Seventh Annual Convention of the *National Non-Partisan Women's Christian Temperance Union*, in Washington, D. C.

Dec. 13.—Second Anniversary of the *Woman's National Sabbath Alliance*, in New York City.

Dec. 16-17.—Convention in the interests of *National Righteousness and Christian Citizenship*, in Chicago.

Dec. 22.—Twenty-seventh Annual Meeting of the *Ocean Grove Camp Meeting Association*, at Ocean Grove, N. J.

Dec. 29-30.—Annual Meeting of the *Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, in New York City. Also Annual Meeting of the *American Church History Society* in the same place. The Society was amalgamated with the *American Historical Association*.

Jan. 3-10.—Week of Prayer.

Jan. 8.—*Enthronement* of Dr. Temple as *Archbishop of Canterbury*.

Jan 10.—*Foreign Mission Day* in the United States and Canada.

PERSONAL.

Père Olivier, of the Dominican Order, has been appointed to succeed Mgr. d'Hulst as *Lenten Preacher at Notre Dame*, Paris.

The Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, of Edinburgh, has been elected *Moderator* of the General Assembly of the *Scotch Free Church*, but declines.

The Rev. Dr. Mair has been elected *Moderator* of the General Assembly of the *Scotch Established Church*.

The Rev. E. E. Chivers, D.D., has been elected *General Secretary* of the *Baptist Young People's Union of America*.

ROMAN CATHOLIC.

The selection of the *Rev. Dr. James E. Quigley* as *Bishop of Buffalo, N. Y.*, has been approved by the Pope.

The Very Rev. E. F. Prendergast, V.G., has been made *Auxiliary Bishop of Philadelphia*, with the title of *Bishop of Scillio, Tunis*.

EDUCATIONAL—COLLEGES.

The Rev. D. E. Jenkins, M.A., was inaugurated president of *Parsons College*, Iowa, December 17.

Dr. Willis Green Craig, of McCormick Theological Seminary, has been elected president of *Centre College*, Danville, Ky.

The Rev. Thomas Trotter, of

Wolfville, N. S., has been elected president of *Acadia College*, Canada.

President Potter, of *Hobart College*, N. Y., has resigned.

Dr. Overbeck, Professor of Church History at *Basel*, has resigned after twenty-five years of service there.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

The Board of Directors of the (Presbyterian) *Western Theological Seminary* have created a new chair of "*Sacred Rhetoric and Elocution*."

The Rev. Jacob Fry, D.D., has recently accepted a professor-

ship in *Mount Airy Theological Seminary*, Philadelphia.

The Rev. D. F. Davies has accepted the professorship of *Dogmatic Theology* in the *Divinity School, Kenyon College*, Gambier, O.

OBITUARY.

De Laney, Rev. James (Baptist), at Whitewater, Wis., Dec. 18, aged 92. Mr. De Laney was born in Ballymore, Ireland, of Catholic parents; after the death of his parents and a severe struggle with poverty, he enlisted in the British Army and was sent to India; there, at Maulmain, he came under the influence of the missionaries Judson and Kincaid, the latter of whom baptized him in 1831; his release from the army was secured through these missionaries, and he came to America; he took the regular course of study in the Hamilton Literary and Theological Institute; was ordained over the Broadalpin Church, N. Y., 1838; removed to Ticonderoga, N. Y., 1839; served subsequently at Granville and Kingsbury, N. Y.; removed to take charge of the church at East Troy, Wis., 1844; after seven years' service there, he took charge successively at Horicon, Sparta, Port Washington, and Whitewater; served six years as Exploring Missionary for the American Baptist Home Missionary Society in Wisconsin; during the war he was chaplain of the Eighteenth Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteers. He was connected with almost all the Baptist institutions in the State, and helped to form nearly all the associations of his denomination there.

Galloway, Rev. Oliver P. (Presbyterian), *Ph.D.* (Wooster University), *Pol.D.* (College of American Politics), in Harrodsburg, Ky., Dec. 2, aged 54. He was a graduate of Warren, now Ogden, College; entered the ministry as a missionary in Tennessee, 1869; served as pastor of Bethlehem and Pleasant Grove churches; removed to the care of the Shiloh church, 1874; became President of Perryville Seminary, 1876; re-entered the pastorate at Assumption, Ill., 1881; removed to Adair, Ia., 1893; resigned that charge in 1895, going to Harrodsburg, Ky., where in ill health he remained until his death.

Knight-Bruce, Rt. Rev. G. W. H. (Anglican), *D.D.*, at Bovey Tracey, Eng., Dec. 16, aged 44. He was born in Middlesex; received his education at Eton and at Merton College, Oxford, graduating from the latter, B.A., 1876, and M.A., 1881; he was ordained deacon in 1876, and priest, 1877; became curate of Bibury, 1876; curate of St. Wendron, Cornwall, 1878; was made vicar of St. George, Everton, 1882; became curate-in-charge of St. Andrew's, Bethnal Green, 1884; was consecrated third bishop of Bloemfontein, Africa, 1886; was translated to Mashonaland as its first bishop in 1891; re-

signed his bishopric because of ill health resulting from his hard labors in that field, returned home and was made vicar of Bovey Tracey the same year.

Morris, Rev. John (Congregationalist, Welsh), *D.D.*, at Brecon, Wales, Nov. 27, aged 83. He was born in Carmarthen, Wales, but received his education at Blackburn College, England; was ordained to the charge of the Congregational church at Springhead, Yorkshire, 1837; assumed charge of the historic church at Morley, called in the Domesday Book "St. Mary's in-the-Wood," in 1841; was elected principal of the Congregational College at Brecon, Wales, to succeed Professor Griffiths, 1854. He has presided over that institution for forty-two years. In 1879 he was president of the Union of Welsh Independents.

Pollock, Rev. Thomas Benson (Anglican), in Birmingham, Eng., Dec. 15, aged 60. He was born in the Isle of Man; graduated from Dublin University, B.A., 1859, and M.A., 1863; was ordained deacon at Chester in 1861, and priest, 1862; was appointed curate at St. Luke's, Leek, the same year, and some time afterward became curate at St. Thomas's, Stamford Hill; in 1865 he went to visit his brother when the work was just beginning at St. Alban's Mission in Birmingham, his intention being to stay a fortnight; but he became interested in the work and stayed as his brother's assistant. This noted mission owes its success largely to the organizing ability and educational experience of Mr. Pollock. The departed clergyman was a pro-

lific writer of devotional books and hymns, among the former being the widely appreciated "Daily Round" (1880); "Meditations on the Morning Psalms" (1888); "Meditations on the Evening Psalms" (1894); and a compilation known as "Daily Life" (1885). "The Narrow Way" also owes much to his editorial supervision and re-writing. His is also the beautiful hymn, "Saviour, most loving, bending before Thee," in St. Alban's Litany appendix.

Saxe, Rev. George Godfrey (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.* (Ohio State University), in Madison, N. J., Dec. 22, aged 74. He was born at Plattsburgh, N. Y.; received his education at Cazenovia, N. Y.; taught school for a time, and entered the Methodist ministry in 1848; he served four years at Fairhaven, Vt., and the same length of time at Poultney; in 1856 ill health compelled him to rest from preaching, and he became professor in the Troy Conference Academy in Poultney; the trouble continued with his throat, and he decided to enter business; he became connected with the Estey Organ and Piano Company, and eventually a member of the firm, subsequently known as Estey & Saxe; during all this time he had maintained his connection with Troy Conference, and used the wealth he gained in its service.

Tappan, Rev. Benjamin (Congregationalist), *D.D.*, at Norridgewock, Me., Dec. 3, aged 81. He was born in Augusta, Me.; was graduated from Bowdoin College, 1833, and from Bangor Theological Seminary, 1837; he was ordained pastor at Hampden, Me., 1838; was

called to Charlestown, Mass., 1848; assumed charge of the church at Norridgewock, Me., 1858, remaining in that position till 1887, when he resigned; he served as a member of the Board of Overseers of Bowdoin College, 1864-87, and was a trustee of Bangor Theological Seminary, 1868-78. He was one of the most eminent and widely known of New England clergymen.

Tuffnell, Rt. Rev. Edward Wyndham (Anglican), *D.D.*, at Chichester, Dec. 3, aged 83. He was born in Walcot, Somerset; was educated at Eton and at Wadham College, Oxford, graduating in 1837, and being elected a fellow of his college; he became rector of Beachingstoke, Wilts., 1846; was transferred to the charge of St. Peter and St. Paul's, Marlborough, 1857; was senior proctor at Oxford that year and select preacher there the following year; was consecrated bishop of Brisbane, 1859; resigned in 1875, returning to England and taking a small parish; was appointed vicar of Croydon in 1879; was made canon of Chichester, 1882, and the same year became vicar of Felpham, offices which he held at the time of his death.

Van Benschoten, Rev. Sandford (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, in Passaic, N. J., Dec. 18, aged 64. He was born in Dutchess County, N. Y.; entered the East Genesee Conference in 1858; in 1868 he was transferred to Newark Conference and became pastor of St. Paul's Church, at Elizabeth; thence was appointed to St. Luke's Church, in Newark, to Emory Church, in Jersey City, and to Morristown, N. J., all among

the most important charges in that almost metropolitan Conference; at the close of his term at Morristown, in 1879, he removed to Trenton, N. J., where he was pastor of State Street Church; then he returned to Newark Conference, and after a pastoral term at Passaic was appointed presiding elder of Elizabeth District; four years later he was transferred to Newark District, where he continued six years, and in 1894 was placed in charge of Pater-son District.

Andrews, Rev. John K. (Presbyterian), *D.D.*, in New Castle, Pa., Dec. 1, aged 74.

Baird, Rev. Enoch F. (Congregational), in York, O., Dec. 14, aged 80.

Bird, Rev. William (Canadian Methodist Episcopal), at Belleville, Can., Dec. 14, aged 90.

Brown, Rev. George W. (Reformed Episcopal), *M.D.*, at Warren, R. I., Nov. 22.

Cheeseman, Rev. and Hon. Joseph James (President of Liberia, Baptist), in Edina, Liberia, Nov. 11, aged 54.

Clover, Rev. Lewis P. (Protestant Episcopal), *D.D.*, at New Hackensack, N. Y., Nov. 9, aged 78.

Crane, Rev. Oliver (Presbyterian), *D.D.*, *LL.D.*, in Boston, Nov. 29.

Fabre, Most Rev. Archbishop (Roman Catholic), in Montreal, Dec. 29.

Fenton, Rev. Thomas (Anglican), at Ings, Westmoreland, Nov. 24, aged 77.

Fisk, Rev. Franklin (Methodist Episcopal), at Auburndale, Mass., Dec. 10, aged 82.

- Fitzgerald, Rt. Rev. William* (Roman Catholic bishop of Ross, Ireland), *D.D.*, in Ireland, Nov. 24.
- Gill, Rev. William Wyatt* (Congregationalist), *LL.D.*, in Sydney, New South Wales, Nov. 26, aged 69.
- Goodrich, Rev. A. B.* (Protestant Episcopal), *D.D.*, in Utica, N. Y., Dec. 16, aged 67.
- Jewett, Rev. Fyman* (Baptist missionary), *D.D.*, in Fitchburg, Mass., Jan. 7, aged 83.
- Laird, Rev. William H.* (Protestant Episcopal), in Rockville, Md., Dec. 10, aged 55.
- McCauley, Rev. James A.* (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, ex-president of Dickinson College, in Baltimore, Md., Dec. 15.
- McClung, Rev. John N.* (Presbyterian), at Springfield, O., Dec. 7, aged 65.
- Phillips, Rev. Alfred Moore* (Canadian Methodist), in Montreal, Dec. 16, aged 50.
- Rankine, Rev. James* (Protestant Episcopal), *D.D.*, rector of the Delancey Divinity School, at Geneva, N. Y., Dec. 6, aged 69.
- Robinson, Rev. James* (Presbyterian), *M.D.*, in Philadelphia, Dec. 13, aged 51.
- Robbins, Rev. A. B.* (Congregationalist), *D.D.*, one of the famous "Iowa Band," at Muscatine, Ia., Dec. 27. He was pastor at Muscatine for fifty-three years.
- Row, Rev. C. A.* (Anglican), Prebendary of St. Paul's, London, aged 80.
- Sayre, Rev. William* (Presbyterian), at Pine Plains, N. Y., Nov. 27, aged 88.
- Smith, Rev. W. L.* (Methodist Episcopal), in Albany, N. Y., Dec. 9, aged 58.
- Thompson, Rev. Alexander* (Presbyterian), at Pittsburg, Dec. 21, aged 58.
- Wainwright, Rev. George W.* (Congregationalist), *D.D.*, in Blair, Neb., Dec. 18.
- Wells, Rev. James Morgan*, *D.D.*, in Fort Worth, Tex., Dec. 1.
- White, Rev. James* (Cumberland Presbyterian), in Greenview, Ill., Dec. 19, aged 82.
- White, Rev. Thomas* (Anglican), *LL.D.*, in Hambledon, Eng.
- Williams, Rev. Herbert* (Anglican), Prebendary, in Brecon, Wales, Nov. 19, aged 60.
- Worden, Rev. A. T.* (Baptist), at Ames, N. Y., Dec. 6.

CALENDAR.

[The compiler will welcome notices of meetings of general importance and interest, provided such notices reach him before the 10th of the month prior to that in which the meetings are to take place. Exact dates and names of places, when and where the meetings are to be held, are desired.]

Feb. 2. — Consecration of the *Rev. Dr. J. D. Morrison* as bishop of Duluth, in Albany, N. Y.

March 8-12.—Metropolitan Council of the *Evangelical Free Churches of England*, in Rochester.

Christian Literature

A Monthly Review of
Religious Thought and Movement

30 Cents a Number \$3.00 a Year

Advertising Rates on Application
Address all Communications to

The Christian Literature Co.

NEW YORK

FEBRUARY, 1897.

Do not fail to take advantage of the premium offer to both new and old subscribers announced on another page. We make this offer in the hope that our old subscribers will, after taking advantage of it themselves, make it known to others who may not be acquainted with the magazine or its scope. All orders must be sent to us direct.

WHEN in New York stop at the St. Denis Hotel. It is thoroughly first-class. The famous "Taylor Restaurant," which forms a part of the hotel, is noted for the excellence of its table and its moderate charges, considering the high quality of service.

We are still able to commence a few new subscriptions with the first number of the current volume (November, 1896) containing the first instalment of "American Christianity."

THIS issue of CHRISTIAN LITERATURE contains advertisements of several of the leading bicycles. When writing for catalogues, be sure you mention that you saw the ad in "CHRISTIAN LITERATURE."

ONE of the most interesting and authoritative criticisms of Mr.

Lang's life of Lockhart is contributed to *Blackwood's Magazine* by Mrs. Oliphant. She thinks that Lockhart has no need of an apologist, however reverent or tender that apologist may be. She admits that Lockhart in his early days was much to blame when he laughed and played with other people's reputations and held them up to scorn, and that he was essentially injured by his own reckless, boyish folly and love of mischief. It seems that to the end of his life Lockhart contributed to *Blackwood*, and now and then compiled a *Noctes* with much evident enjoyment to himself, which the disreeter publisher suppressed. — *British Weekly*.

A Notable Store.

POSSIBLY the largest strictly dry-goods store in America is that of Messrs. Strawbridge & Clothier, Philadelphia. This firm, through its extensive advertising and accurate, trustworthy method of transacting business, has attained a success in mercantile life that is not equalled by many. The mail order department has customers at almost every post-office in the United States. Many of these customers have been gained through goods advertised as special prices. Almost every week a neat advertisement of a certain line of goods is sent out. The goods are accurately described, and the price—which invariably covers cost of mailing—is named. If the goods are not satisfactory to the buyer, they may be returned and the purchase-money will be promptly refunded. None need fear to send for goods advertised over the name of Strawbridge & Clothier. In Philadelphia and throughout the country their name is a synonym for all that is just and fair in business.